



3 9999 06422 202 7

[DOCUMENT 6 — 1922.]

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT
RECEIVED

FEB 23 1920

ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
BUILDING DEPARTMENT
FOR THE YEAR 1921.

BOSTON, February 1, 1922.

HON. ANDREW J. PETERS,
Mayor of the City of Boston:

SIR,— In compliance with section 1, chapter 550, of the Acts of 1907, and section 24, chapter 3, of the Revised Ordinances, a statement of the operations of the department from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921, is herewith presented, except financial statement, which is for the fiscal year ending January 31, 1922.

Owing to the fact that the cities throughout the country have generally adopted the calendar year for their annual reports, and further, so many requests having been received by this department for such a statement (for comparison and statistical purposes), with the approval of the Corporation Counsel this department has adopted the calendar year for all statements of building operations, but adhere to the fiscal year (February 1 to February 1) for financial statements.

HERBERT A. WILSON,
Building Commissioner.

50120C
6354
52
1921

Statement of Building Operations in the City of Boston for the Year Ending December 31, 1921.

(As compared with preceding years.)

	1921.		1920.		1919.		1918.		1917.	
	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.
First class.....	372	\$11,232,550	290	\$13,176,075	291	\$10,812,647	96	\$2,752,300	272	\$11,068,127
Second class.....	403	3,842,677	219	3,372,124	239	3,936,825	93	945,915	315	5,453,934
Third class.....	808	2,806,461	526	1,130,383	707	1,186,734	287	407,107	607	1,818,086
Special.....	121	80,060	10	4,550						
Total, new work.....	1,704	\$17,961,748	1,045	\$17,683,132	1,237	\$15,936,206	476	\$4,105,322	1,194	\$18,340,147
Alterations.....	6,278	6,087,055	5,392	10,495,121	4,805	7,584,649	3,505	3,600,868	3,485	4,954,014
Totals.....	7,982	\$24,048,803	6,437	\$28,178,253	6,042	\$23,520,855	3,979	\$7,703,190	4,679	\$23,294,161
Plumbing.....	2,603	\$1,234,957	2,507	\$1,714,401	2,447	\$1,219,517	1,460	\$676,825	2,523	\$1,475,695
Gas fitting.....	10,174	497,189	7,309	506,263	6,265	354,079	4,815	222,180	7,060	336,374
Heating, etc.	544	607,953	583	796,274	485	672,016	333	703,008	804	742,117
Elevators, freight.....	138	263,820	233	524,006	155	331,354	119	276,047	170	388,461
Elevators, passenger.....	88	562,575	82	493,120	50	220,763	19	90,025	60	321,190
Signs, etc.....	50	29,060	37	36,800	21	9,675	15	5,910	32	25,545
Fire escapes.....	95	33,501	65	48,535	131	30,168	83	23,050	252	73,614
Take-downs, wooden.....	248	36,728	299	43,345	344	32,947	254	16,772	382	27,948
Take-downs, brick.....	37	16,860	119	29,896	121	34,710	52	13,845	133	31,205
Totals.....	13,977	\$3,282,045	11,234	\$4,192,640	10,019	\$2,905,229	7,150	\$2,027,662	11,416	\$3,422,239
Grand totals.....	21,959	\$27,331,448	17,671	\$32,370,893	16,061	\$26,426,084	11,129	\$9,733,852	16,095	\$26,716,400

Statement Showing Volume and Nature of Current Building Construction in the City of Boston, December 31 1921.

BUILDING DEPARTMENT.

3

[illegible]

Table Showing the Purposes, Number and Estimated Cost Above the Land of New Buildings and Alterations for which Applications have been Filed during Year 1921.

	FIRST CLASS.		SECOND CLASS.		THIRD CLASS.		SPECIAL CLASS.		ALTERATIONS.		TOTALS.	
	Number.	Estimated Cost.	Number.	Estimated Cost.	Number.	Estimated Cost.	Number.	Estimated Cost.	Number.	Estimated Cost.	Number.	Estimated Cost.
Apartment houses.....			2	\$155,000					28	\$50,950	30	\$205,950
Apartment houses and stores....									6	4,525	6	4,525
Banks.....									6	128,005	6	128,005
Churches.....	1	\$140,000	1	147,000					46	243,455	48	530,455
Colleges.....									1	600	1	600
Dwellings.....			21	263,000	288	\$2,420,000			4,031	1,494,489	4,340	4,177,789
Dwellings and stores.....			1	2,600	1	3,000			252	246,364	254	251,964
Foundries.....									6	6,817	6	6,817
Garages.....	329	4,203,650	250	534,371	304	153,811	86	\$38,685	150	92,319	1,117	2,022,836
Hotels.....									29	179,690	29	179,690
Hospitals.....	3	819,500			1	6,000			16	48,065	20	873,565
Lodging houses.....			1	47,700	1	6,000			51	250,765	53	304,465
Lodging houses and stores.....									17	9,376	17	9,376
Moving picture houses.....									7	207,500	7	207,500
Mercantile buildings.....	7	501,000	58	911,080	13	53,650	5	5,700	568	1,164,744	651	2,636,174

Manufacturing buildings.....	8	450,500	13	213,750	2	5,000			182	788,485	205	1,463,735
Office buildings.....	7	5,379,000	13	364,050	1	500	4	2,625	147	575,670	172	6,321,845
Public buildings.....	3	790,000	3	325,000					18	49,000	24	1,164,000
Public halls.....	2	170,000	1	25,000					15	42,575	18	237,575
Railway stations.....												
Schoolhouses.....	5	1,510,500			1	44,685			23	108,069	29	1,663,254
Stables.....			1	1,500	1	8,000			164	79,319	166	88,819
Tenement houses.....			15	781,000	2	35,000			117	86,215	134	902,215
Tenement houses and stores.....									104	87,976	104	87,976
Theatres.....	2	250,000							11	5,700	13	255,700
Miscellaneous.....	7	12,400	23	71,626	193	70,515	26	33,050	283	136,382	532	323,973
Totals.....	372	\$11,232,550	403	\$3,842,677	808	\$2,806,461	121	\$80,060	6,278	\$6,087,055	7,982	\$24,048,803

Table Showing the Material, Number and Estimated Cost of New Buildings and Alterations for which Applications Have Been Filed:

	Number.	Estimated Cost.
Brick buildings.....	282	\$8,641,990
Stone buildings.....	8	3,008,100
Concrete and reinforced concrete buildings.....	308	983,195
Steel frame buildings.....	6	2,290,000
Terra cotta buildings.....	10	23,300
Other fire-resisting buildings.....	275	192,352
Totals.....	889	\$15,138,937
Alterations, etc., brick buildings.....	1,540	\$3,138,937
Alterations, etc., stone buildings.....	91	472,235
Alterations, etc., of concrete and reinforced buildings.....	56	487,501
Alterations, etc., steel and frame buildings.....	25	374,075
Alterations, etc., of terra cotta buildings.....	5	7,125
Alterations, etc., of other fire-resisting buildings.....	15	3,210
Totals.....	1,732	\$4,518,719
Wooden buildings.....	815	\$2,822,811
Alterations, etc., of wooden buildings.....	4,546	1,568,336
Grand totals.....	7,982	\$24,048,803

Applications Filed and Estimated Cost.

	Number.	Cost.
First-class buildings.....	372	\$11,232,550
Second-class buildings.....	403	3,842,677
Third-class buildings.....	808	2,806,461
Special.....	121	80,060
Alterations.....	6,278	6,087,055
Boilers, engines, etc.....	544	607,953
Plumbing.....	2,603	1,234,957
Gasfitting.....	10,174	497,189
Elevators, etc.....	226	826,395
Fire escapes.....	95	33,501
Signs.....	50	29,060
Take-downs.....	385	53,588
Totals.....	21,959	\$27,331,448

Examinations.

New buildings	11,521
Alterations	20,589
Boilers, engines, etc	759
Plumbing	15,436
Gasfitting	12,979
Elevators	13,105
Egress	6,687
Plans and applications	4,917
Specials	18
Fires	706
Theatres	1,673
Public halls	1,200
Moving picture houses	823
Special moving picture entertainments	103
Unsafe buildings and dangerous chimneys	596
Dilapidated buildings	2,137
Sprinklers	1,870
Concrete and piling	1,653
Gas asphyxiation	140
Elevator accidents	49
Building accidents	4
Total	<u>145,397</u>

Reports.

Unsafe buildings and dangerous chimneys	596
Dilapidated buildings	268
Fires	706
Accidents	186
Specials	18
Violations	770
Finals	5,713
Elevators	13,105
Sprinklers	1,870
Egress	6,687
Theatres	1,673
Public halls	1,200
Moving picture houses	823
Special moving picture entertainments	103
Concrete and piling	1,653
Total	<u>35,371</u>

Board of Appeal.

Appeals received	514
Appeals sustained	258
Appeals sustained conditionally	84
Appeals dismissed	54
Appeals withdrawn	9
Partly sustained and partly dismissed	9
Appeals pending	50
Appeal decisions rendered	464

Table Showing Number of Buildings Erected for Purposes of Habitation and Number of Families Provided for.

NUMBER FAMILIES IN EACH BUILDING.	1916.		1917.		1918.		1919.		1920.		1921.	
	Number Buildings.	Number Families.	Number Buildings.	Number Families.	Number Buildings.	Number Families.	Number Buildings.	Number Families.	Number Buildings.	Number Families.	Number Buildings.	Number Families.
1.....	155	155	84	84	15	15	74	74	63	63	138	138
2.....	291	582	117	234	8	16	38	76	25	50	133	266
3.....	503	1,509	106	318	2	6	14	42	17	51	45	135
4.....	4	16	1	4					1	4	1	4
5.....							3	15				
6.....	26	156	3	18			2	12			1	6
7.....	3	21	1	7								
8.....	13	104	4	32								
9.....			3	27					2	18	1	9
10.....	5	50										
11.....	1	11										
12.....	6	72	2	24			1	12				
13.....	2	26										
14.....	5	70	2	28			3	42				
15.....	5	75	1	15			1	15				
16.....	20	320	14	224			3	48				
17.....	1	17	2	34								
18.....	6	108	1	18					2	36		
19.....	2	38	5	95								
20.....	15	300	2	40			2	40			3	60
21.....	1	21	2	21			1	21				
22.....											1	22
23.....	1	23	2	46					2	46		
24.....	6	144	1	24								
25.....	1	25										
26.....									2	52	2	52
28.....							3	84				
30.....	1	30										
35.....												
46.....	2	92										
50.....											1	50
Total.....	1,075	3,965	352	1,293	25	37	145	481	114	320	337	878

In comparison with the large cities of the United States, the building activities of Boston for years 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921 make a good showing:

	1918.	1919.	1920.	1921.
Los Angeles.....	\$8,678,863	\$28,253,849	\$60,023,600	\$82,713,386
Washington, D. C...	7,172,818	20,402,292	19,511,928	24,327,134
Chicago.....	34,792,200	105,080,850	79,102,650	124,028,010
Boston.....	7,704,190 (7)	23,520,855 (8)	28,278,853 (7)	24,144,923 (8)
Detroit.....	17,967,449	82,995,071	77,737,165	58,086,081
St. Louis.....	6,298,582	20,538,460	17,170,348	12,324,133
New York.....	55,461,479	251,461,479	271,463,986	443,106,299
Akron.....	4,596,596	25,443,498	20,347,569	3,782,548
Cleveland.....	16,385,800	47,707,975	65,625,100	46,531,323
Philadelphia.....	1,984,175	63,627,209	55,337,240	43,291,550

In 1921, out of 192 cities in the United States (statistics obtained) Boston is No. 10 in relation to building operations, the two cities not included in the list above but leading Boston in 1921 are Baltimore, 32,565,010, and Milwaukee, 24,976,025.

NOTE.— Boston never was comparable to New York, Chicago and Philadelphia, owing to their much greater area, and population and consequent more numerous building operations.

Detroit and Cleveland are growing rapidly because of the establishment there of the ever-growing automotive industry.

Los Angeles for the similar reason of its being the center of a great and growing cinema industry, and further because of an impetus given to civic building aggressiveness, since facilities for the city becoming a seaport have been established.

The total estimated increase in tax valuation by construction and improvement for the year 1921 is \$27,248,800.

January 1, 1920, there were 31,993 brick buildings and 75,772 wooden buildings in Boston. Since that date, up to January 1, 1922, applications have been filed to erect 775 brick and 929 wooden buildings; 37 brick and 248 wooden buildings have been taken down and 17 wooden buildings have been totally destroyed by fire — making a total of 109,167 buildings in Boston January 1, 1922, as follows: Brick, 32,731, wood, 76,436.

Valuation (estimated) of buildings in Boston which come within the jurisdiction of the building law:

1872	\$168,607,700
1921 (January 1)	\$641,275,876
New construction in 1921	\$17,961,748
Total loss by fire in 1921	\$146,600
Take-downs in 1921	\$53,588
Estimated value for January 1, 1922	<u>\$659,037,436</u>

Estimated valuation of buildings in Boston (January 1, 1922) exempted from the operations of the building laws and not included in the estimate of building operations under the Building Department:

United States Government	\$54,708,800
Commonwealth of Massachusetts	9,549,100
County of Suffolk	5,928,700
Railroad stations, etc.	7,881,700
Elevated structures	5,495,000
Subways (7)	34,954,000
Arlington Street Station	1,150,000
Buildings, Public Parks	1,346,000
Total	<u>\$121,013,300</u>

Number of master gasfitters licensed from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921	20
Number of journeymen gasfitters licensed from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921	30
Total	<u>50</u>

The property of the department consists of its records, books, plans, typewriting machines, camera, two adding machines, three automobiles and two time-clock stamps.

Three hundred and twenty-eight complaints have been referred to the Law Department from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921, for legal action; 14 were for neglect to provide egress as required, 312 for violation of the building law and 2 for maintaining unsafe buildings after notice to secure or take down.

Seven hundred and fifty-two complaints pending before the Law Department have been closed. Of these, 355 were for egress not provided, 397 for violation of the building law, and 0 for maintaining unsafe buildings after notice to secure or take down.

Statement showing the five leading purposes, number and estimated cost above the land of first, second and third class buildings for which applications have been filed during the year 1921:

PURPOSES.	Number.	Estimated Cost.
Offices.....	25	\$5,746,175
Dwellings.....	309	2,683,300
Garages.....	967	1,930,577
Mercantile.....	83	1,471,430
Public buildings.....	6	1,115,000

Statement showing the five leading purposes, number and estimated cost of proposed alterations during the year 1921 for which applications have been filed:

PURPOSES.	Number.	Estimated Cost.
Dwellings.....	4,031	\$1,494,489
Mercantile.....	568	1,164,744
Manufacturing.....	182	788,485
Offices.....	147	575,670
Lodging houses.....	51	250,765

ITEMS OF INTEREST.

Tallest buildings:

Custom House, 495 feet.

Ames Building, 196 feet.

Covering greatest ground area:

South Station, 1,457,522 square feet.

North Station, 690,963 square feet.

(New) John Hancock Building, 67,081 square feet.

Boston Arena, 60,700 square feet.

Revere Sugar Refinery, main building, 77,750 square feet.

Sugar storage shed, 45,375 square feet.

Edison Electric Illuminating Company Plant, L and

East First streets, South Boston, 188,650 square feet.

Storehouse, Army Supply Base, South Boston, 206,388 square feet.

State House, 163,444 square feet.

Mechanics Building, 109,890 square feet.

Oldest building:

Paul Revere's House, 1660.

First building built:

William Blackstone House, 1630.

Among the costliest buildings:

Storehouse, Army Supply Base, South Boston.

Copley-Plaza Hotel, \$3,000,000 above land.

Public Library, \$2,500,000 above land.

GENERAL STATISTICS.

Area of Boston:

30,598 acres (47.81) square miles.

Value of buildings (including subways), \$780,040,736.

(Estimated) January 1, 1922.

Population:

(Estimated) July 1, 1922, 764,017. United States census, 1920, gives 748,143.

Number of buildings occupied for habitation:

(Estimated) January 1, 1922, 81,580.

It is estimated that the population of Boston increases about 12,000 per year.

PILING AND CONCRETE INSPECTIONS.

Average number of inspectors of piling and concrete .	20
---	----

Total number of days' work	1,653
--------------------------------------	-------

Cost for employment of same (paid by contract) .	\$8,430
--	---------

BUILDERS' LICENSES.

See Annual Report of Board of Examiners included in this report.

THEATRES AND PUBLIC HALLS.

The inspection and supervision of conditions surrounding theatres and public halls is assigned by the Mayor to this department.

LIST OF LICENSED PUBLIC LODGING HOUSES EXAMINED MONTHLY BY THIS DEPARTMENT.

Causeway street, No. 19.

Commercial street, No. 164.

Commercial street, No. 194.

Commercial street, No. 234.

Davis street, No. 17.

Eliot street, No. 120.

Washington street, No. 1051.

Washington street, No. 1202.

Washington street, No. 1025.

The following lodging houses are licensed as inns:

People's Palace, Washington street, corner East Brookline street.

Dawes Hotel, 8 Pine street.

Boston and Maine Railroad Employees' Y. M. C. A.

**List of Theatres With Their Location and Seating Capacity
Examined Monthly in Accordance with Chapter 450, Acts of
1907, and Amendments Thereto.**

NAME.	Location.	Total Seating Capacity.
Allston Theatre.....	128 Brighton avenue.....	1,200
Arlington Square Theatre.....	Arlington square.....	1,813
Bijou Theatre.....	545 Washington street.....	838
Boston Opera House.....	Huntington avenue, corner Opera place.....	3,000
Boston Theatre.....	539 Washington street.....	2,848
Bowdoin Square Theatre.....	179-187 Court street.....	1,365
Broadway Theatre.....	420 West Broadway, South Boston.....	1,777
Casino Theatre.....	44 Hanover street.....	1,824
Central Square Theatre.....	36-44 Bennington street, East Boston.....	1,715
Codman Square Theatre.....	637 Washington street, Dorchester.....	2,004
Colonial Theatre.....	100-106 Boylston street.....	1,602
Copley Theatre.....	186 Dartmouth street.....	683
Dudley Theatre.....	2196 Washington street.....	1,358
Fenway Theatre.....	136 Massachusetts avenue.....	1,523
Franklin Park Theatre.....	616-628 Blue Hill avenue.....	1,478
Gaiety Theatre.....	659-667 Washington street.....	1,479
Globe Theatre.....	692 Washington street.....	1,655
Gordon's Olympia Theatre.....	656 and 658 Washington street.....	1,892
Gorman's Theatre.....	700 South street, Roslindale.....	745
Grand Opera House.....	1172-1194 Washington street.....	1,979
Hollis Street Theatre.....	12 Hollis street.....	1,640
Howard Athenæum.....	34 Howard street.....	1,489
Jamaica Theatre.....	413 Centre street, Jamaica Plain.....	1,256
Keith's Theatre.....	547 Washington street.....	2,020
Majestic Theatre.....	219-223 Tremont street.....	1,726
National Theatre.....	535-Tremont street.....	3,106
New Columbia.....	978-998 Washington street.....	1,671
Orpheum.....	415 Washington street.....	2,991
Palace Theatre.....	109-113 Court street.....	1,000
Park Theatre.....	617 Washington street.....	1,020

List of Theatres With Their Location and Seating Capacity
Examined Monthly in Accordance with Chapter 450, Acts of
1907, and Amendments Thereto.— Concluded.

NAME.	Location.	Total Seating Capacity.
Park Square Theatre.....	11 Columbus avenue.....	1,115
Plymouth Theatre.....	129 Eliot street.....	1,390
Scollay Square Theatre.....	1 Tremont row.....	2,589
Shawmut Theatre.....	362A Blue Hill avenue.....	1,573
St. James Theatre.....	239 Huntington avenue.....	1,711
Shubert Theatre.....	263 and 265 Tremont street.....	1,590
Strand Theatre.....	Columbia road, Dorchester.....	1,870
Strand Theatre.....	177 Huntington avenue.....	1,017
Thompson Square Theatre....	Main street, Charlestown.....	900
Tremont Theatre.....	176 Tremont street.....	1,735
Wilbur Theatre.....	250 Tremont street.....	1,227

A total of 41 theatres.

Capital Theatre, Massachusetts avenue, under construction.

List of Moving Picture Houses with Their Location and Seating Capacity Examined Monthly.

NAME.	Location.	Total Seating Capacity.
Apollo Theatre Hall.....	1048 and 1050 Washington street.....	775
Ayer's Exeter St. Theatre Hall,	Exeter street.....	1,032
Brighton Theatre Hall.....	400 Market street, Brighton.....	480
Beacon Theatre Hall.....	47-53 Tremont street.....	775
Cobb Theatre Hall.....	1009 Washington street.....	673
Congress Theatre Hall.....	320 Broadway, South Boston.....	691
Criterion Theatre Hall.....	1122-1124 Columbus avenue.....	793
Dorchester Theatre Hall.....	1524 Dorchester avenue.....	793
Day Square Theatre Hall.....	284 Bennington street, East Boston.....	691
Eagle Theatre Hall.....	2225-2531 Washington street.....	772
Egleston Theatre Hall.....	3093 Washington street.....	519
Elizabeth Peabody House.....	357 Charles street.....	306
Everett Square Theatre Hall...	17 and 19 Fairmount avenue, Hyde Park...	799
Gem Theatre Hall.....	32 Meridian street, East Boston.....	915
Hamilton Theatre Hall.....	256 Bowdoin street, Dorchester.....	607
Hyde Park Theatre Hall.....	1254 Hyde Park avenue.....	730
Imperial Theatre Hall.....	619 Broadway, South Boston.....	683
Lancaster Theatre Hall.....	Lancaster street.....	1,341
Loew's Theatre Hall.....	530 Dudley street.....	694
Magnet Theatre Hall.....	301 Washington street, Dorchester.....	762
Mattapan Theatre Hall.....	512 River street, Mattapan.....	322
Modern Theatre Hall.....	523-529 Washington street.....	754
Niagara Theatre Hall.....	320 Blue Hill avenue.....	760
Old South Theatre Hall.....	329 Washington street.....	778
Olympia Theatre Hall.....	420 Broadway, South Boston.....	660
Olympia Theatre Hall.....	6 Bowdoin square.....	600
Orient Gardens Hall.....	Bennington street, East Boston.....	758
Puritan Theatre Hall.....	1742 Washington street.....	703
Roxbury Theatre Hall.....	2170 Washington street.....	662
Star Theatre Hall.....	5 Tremont row.....	365
Strand Theatre Hall.....	658 Centre street, Jamaica Plain.....	500
Suffolk Theatre Hall.....	55 Temple street.....	1,030
Supreme Theatre Hall.....	292 Centre street, Jamaica Plain.....	495
Unique Theatre Hall.....	700 Washington street.....	456
Washington Theatre Hall.....	722 Washington street.....	748
Winthrop Theatre Hall.....	570 Columbia road.....	400

A total of 36 moving picture houses.

List of Licensed Public Halls of a Capacity of 400 and Over.

NAME.	Location.	Total Seating Capacity.
Armory Hall.....	12 Maverick square, East Boston.....	441
Boston Schwaben Hall.....	194 Heath street.....	527
Boylston Grand Hall.....	17 and 19 Otisfield street.....	658
Boston Arena Hall.....	238 St. Botolph street.....	5,786
Bloomfield Hall.....	1 Tonawanda street.....	480
Bethesda Hall.....	409 Broadway, South Boston.....	491
Berkeley Hall.....	4 Berkeley street.....	501
Boston College Hall.....	James street.....	1,500
Butler Hall.....	1095 Tremont street.....	606
Brunswick Hall.....	395 Blue Hill avenue.....	512
Casino Hall.....	133 Shawmut avenue.....	650
Converse Hall.....	70-82 Tremont street.....	2,541
Chipman Hall.....	70-82 Tremont street.....	473
Copley-Plaza Ball Room.....	138 St. James avenue, Copley square.....	1,293
Catholic Union Hall.....	1682 Washington street.....	400
Corinthian Hall.....	1651 Washington street.....	555
Convention Hall.....	46 St. Botolph street.....	1,087
Commercial Hall.....	7 Green street.....	900
Dudley Street Opera House Hall.	113 Dudley street.....	692
Dorchester Club Hall.....	26 and 28 Talbot avenue.....	487
Dahlgren Hall (upper and lower)	307 E street, South Boston..... {lower..	403
	{upper..	599
Eliot Hall.....	23 Eliot street, Jamaica Plain.....	584
Franklin Union Hall.....	Berkeley street, corner Appleton street.....	986
Ford Hall.....	15 Ashburton place.....	1,020
Fox Hall.....	558 Columbia road.....	485
German Workingmen's Hall..	22-26 Amory street.....	819
Hotel Hemenway Hall.....	91 Westland avenue.....	613
Hotel Somerset Ballroom.....	Commonwealth avenue.....	973
Hotel Vendome Banquet Hall..	160 Commonwealth avenue.....	427
Hibernian Hall.....	184 Dudley street.....	881
Hibernian Hall.....	28 Union street, Charlestown.....	548
Huntington Hall.....	491 Boylston street.....	977
Historic Hall.....	1651 Washington street.....	458
Highland Hall.....	1866 Centre street, West Roxbury.....	465
Horticultural Hall.....	300 Massachusetts avenue.....	550
Intercolonial Hall.....	214 Dudley street.....	834

List of Licensed Public Halls of a Capacity of 400 and Over.—
Continued.

NAME.	Location.	Total Seating Capacity.
Huntington Chambers Hall....	30 Huntington avenue.....	433
Investigator Hall.....	9 Appleton street.....	439
Jordan Hall.....	294 Huntington avenue.....	1,269
Jacob P. Bates Hall.....	316 Huntington avenue.....	429
Jacob Sleeper Hall.....	688 Boylston street.....	429
Kingsley Hall.....	15 Ashburton place.....	485
Knights of Columbus Service Hall.	75-83 Norway street.....	600
Knights of Columbus Hall....	44 High street, Charlestown.....	430
Lithuanian Corporation Hall...	24 and 26 Lincoln street.....	528
Lorimer Hall.....	82 Tremont street.....	820
Maynard Hall.....	243 D street, South Boston.....	532
Mechanics Hall.....	111 Huntington avenue.....	7,229
Majestic Casino Hall.....	7 Northfield street.....	612
Music Hall.....	344-350 Meridian street, East Boston.....	738
O'Connell Hall.....	184 Dudley street.....	409
Odd Fellows Hall.....	515 Tremont street.....	745
Odd Fellows Hall.....	22 North Beacon street and 509 Cambridge street.	419
Paine Memorial Hall.....	9 Appleton street.....	622
Parish Hall.....	Arlington street, Brighton.....	668
Parochial School Hall.....	338-354 Bunker Hill street.....	839
Parker Memorial Hall.....	53 Berkeley street.....	941
Paul Revere Hall.....	111 Huntington avenue.....	689
Pythian Hall.....	1176 River street.....	485
Rivoli Hall.....	235 Huntington avenue.....	700
Ronan Memorial Hall.....	Bowdoin and Codman streets.....	1,174
Roddy Hall.....	58 Market street.....	561
Roughan Hall.....	16 City square and 12 Park street, Charlestown.	929
Ruggles Hall.....	5 Ruggles street.....	527
St. Augustine Hall.....	203 and 205 E street, South Boston.....	1,098
St. Anthony's Hall.....	Holton street, corner Everett street.....	1,146
St. Mary's Hall.....	737 Saratoga street.....	641
Symphony Hall.....	Massachusetts avenue, cor. Huntington ave..	2,509
St. Francis de Sales Hall.....	St. Francis de Sales street.....	647
Sumner Hall.....	198 Sumner street, East Boston.....	1,118
St. Mary's Hall.....	34 Cooper street.....	812

**List of Licensed Public Halls of a Capacity of 400 and Over.—
Concluded.**

NAME.	Location.	Total Seating Capacity.
St. Alphonsus Hall.....	80 Smith street.....	1,134
Steinert Hall.....	162 Boylston street.....	563
St. Mary's Hall.....	Winthrop street, Charlestown.....	371
Strand Hall.....	177 Huntington avenue.....	764
The Chateau Hall.....	353 Huntington avenue.....	565
Waverly Hall.....	1239 River street.....	766
Warren Hall.....	337 Washington street, Brighton.....	515
Whiton Hall.....	38 Centre street, Dorchester.....	601
Winslow Hall.....	67 Warren street, Roxbury.....	464

A total of 81.

List of Licensed Halls where Seating Capacity is Less than 400.

NAME.	Location.	Total Seating Capacity.
Academy Hall.....	15 Leverett street.....	360
Appleton Hall.....	9 Appleton street.....	258
Arcade Hall.....	91 Court street.....	90
Arion Hall.....	367 East Eighth street, South Boston.....	250
Bayside Bungalow.....	28 Dewey street.....	147
Boylston Hall.....	276 Amory street.....	231
Brighthelmstone Hall.....	541 Cambridge street, Allston.....	347
Bernice Hall.....	409 Broadway, South Boston.....	207
Central Square Hall.....	18 Central square, East Boston.....	290
Conant Hall.....	20 Conant street.....	220
Columbus Club Hall.....	Pearl and Pleasant streets, Dorchester.....	375
Colonial Hall (Shepard's).....	133 Tremont street.....	50
Deveraux Hall.....	295 Huntington avenue.....	384
Dexter Hall.....	987 Washington street.....	333
Domino Studio.....	1108 Boylston street.....	200
Dudley Hall.....	2389 Washington street.....	309
Dudley Club Hall.....	51 Dudley street and 23 Kenilworth street..	414
Dwight Hall.....	514 Tremont street.....	274
Eastern Star Associates Hall...	203 Warren street.....	322
Elizabeth Peabody Gymnasium,	357 Charles street.....	242
Faelton Hall.....	30 Huntington avenue.....	143
Fitzedrick Hall.....	155 Capen street, Dorchester.....	159

List of Licensed Halls where Seating Capacity is Less than 400.—
Concluded.

NAME.	Location.	Total Seating Capacity.
Franklin Hall.....	10 Franklin street.....	122
Fraternity Hall.....	27 Poplar street, Roslindale.....	252
Galligan Hall.....	4 Buckingham street, Hyde Park.....	171
Heineman Hall.....	176 Tremont street.....	308
Jacqueminot Hall.....	136 Hancock street.....	223
Jamaica Hall.....	705 Centre street, Jamaica Plain.....	293
John Boyle O'Reilly Hall.....	184 Dudley street.....	266
John J. Williams Hall.....	7 Murray Hill road, Roslindale.....	177
Legion Hall.....	1036 Bennington street, East Boston.....	277
Legion Hall.....	206 Massachusetts avenue.....	204
Lithgow Hall.....	618 Washington street, Dorchester.....	257
Liberty Hall.....	5 Ruggles street.....	386
Lincoln Hall.....	70 Emerald street.....	214
Lotus Bungalow Hall.....	83 Babson street.....	174
Loomis Hall.....	93 Massachusetts avenue.....	175
Masonic Hall.....	41 Fairmount avenue, Hyde Park.....	329
Meridian Hall.....	163 Meridian street, East Boston.....	366
Memorial Hall.....	14 Green street, Charlestown.....	315
Mishawum Hall.....	City square, Charlestown.....	267
Oberts Bungalow Hall.....	608 River street, Mattapan.....	190
Oakland Hall.....	6 Oakland street.....	318
Odd Fellows Hall.....	41 River street, Dorchester.....	294
Palace Arcade Hall.....	92 Court street.....	90
Pilgrim Hall.....	732 Broadway, South Boston.....	205
Pilgrim Hall.....	14 Beacon street.....	320
Putnam Hall.....	1165 Tremont street.....	375
Red Men's Hall.....	514 Tremont street.....	360
Strickland Hall.....	1081 Washington street.....	200
St. Omer Hall.....	376 West Broadway, South Boston.....	199
Seaverns Hall.....	670 Centre street.....	232
Sweeney's School of Dancing...	136 Massachusetts avenue.....	312
Temple Hall.....	521 Cambridge street.....	244
Wells Memorial Hall.....	987 Washington street.....	397
Wolcott Hall.....	32 Central square, East Boston.....	267
Orient Heights Yacht Club....	61 Bayswater street, East Boston.....	185
West End Credit Hall.....	62 Chambers street.....	237

Total of 58.

**Personal Inspection of the Theatres, Moving Picture Houses and
Public Halls.**

Theatres	1,673
Moving picture houses	823
Halls holding over 400 }	1,250
Halls holding under 400 }	
Special moving picture entertainments	103

**Monthly Statement Showing Number of Plans and Applications
Which Have Been Acted Upon by the Plan Division.**

1921.	NEW.		ALTERATIONS.		Total.
	APPROVED.	NOT APPROVED.	APPROVED.	NOT APPROVED.	
	Number of Applications.	Number of Applications.	Number of Applications.	Number of Applications.	
January.....	22	34	103	42	201
February.....	17	29	71	80	197
March.....	53	58	141	163	415
April.....	98	78	161	102	439
May.....	96	73	164	118	451
June.....	119	66	140	101	426
July.....	108	101	161	132	502
August.....	85	66	186	111	448
September.....	122	53	141	177	493
October.....	177	96	166	83	522
November.....	122	86	161	91	460
December.....	94	38	141	90	363
Grand total..	1,113	778	1,736	1,290	4,917

**Statement of the Work Performed Relating to Egress During the
Year 1921.**

Examinations	1,045
Re-examinations	5,642
Theatres	1,673
Movies.	823
Halls	1,200
Special moving picture entertainments	103
Requisitions	517
Letters sent	418
Letters received	318
Buildings provided for	192
Families provided for.	699
Persons provided for	10,131
First-class buildings provided for	7

Second-class buildings provided for	147
Third-class buildings provided for	38
Cost	<u>\$57,945</u>

TAKE-DOWNS AND SHORING.

The following bills, incurred by order of the Building Commissioner with the approval of the Mayor, have been paid from the department appropriation and a copy of each sent to the City Collector for collection:

June 28, 1921. Isaac Blair & Co., shoring wall 14½ Harrison avenue	\$375 00
Rent of shores at same location for six months at \$10	60 00
	<u>\$435 00</u>

Report of Fires for the Year Ending December 31, 1921, Wherein
the Construction of the Building was Affected.

	DAMAGED.		TOTAL LOSS.		
	Number.	Estimated Damage.	Number.	Class.	Loss.
January.....	50	\$126,155	1	Third.	\$7,500
February.....	29	136,745	4	Third.	109,000
March.....	34	80,475	1	Third.	150
April.....	26	40,604	1	Third.	200
May.....	20	59,900	4	Third.	24,700
June.....	24	36,550	2	Third.	1,700
July.....	16	4,085			
August.....	14	17,100	1	Third.	200
September.....	27	56,375	5	Third.	16,900
October.....	24	34,575	1	Third.	1,500
November.....	17	8,275	1	Third.	1,400
December.....	48	83,045	1	Third.	150
Totals.....	329	\$683,884	22	Third.	\$163,400

Under the provisions of chapter 795, section 19, Acts of 1914, which took effect August 1, 1914, the Building Department is not required to investigate the cause, origin or circumstances of any fire occurring in the City of Boston. The above act has been repealed by General Laws, chapter 282, and superseded by General Laws, chapter 148, section 46.

**Classification and Number of Communications January 4, 1921,
to December 31, 1921, Inclusive.**

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED, REFERRED AND ACTED UPON.	Number.
Appeals.....	514
Board of Appeal, decisions.....	464
Board of Examiners, builders' licenses.....	2
City Council orders.....	5
Civil Service Commission.....	19
Collecting Department.....	2
Egress (relative to).....	318
Elevators (relative to).....	393
Examiners of gasfitters.....	2
Finance Commission.....	9
Fire Department.....	531
Fire Underwriters.....	3
Fire Marshal.....	567
Gas examination applications.....	28
Health Department.....	66
Housing Commission.....	16
Law Department.....	11
Mayor.....	89
Miscellaneous.....	1,598
Public Works Department.....	9
Police Department.....	176
Schoolhouse Commission.....	3
Street Commissioners.....	9
Subpoenas.....	15
Totals.....	4,833

**Record of Appointments, Transfers, Resignations, Discharges,
Retirements, Deaths, for the Calendar Year 1921.**

Leo S. Stone, transferred to Transit Commission, January 24, 1921.

Anthony J. Hock, appointed gasfitting inspector, January 17, 1921.

Thomas McCullough, building inspector, died, February 19, 1921.

Henry W. Damon, building inspector (construction engineer), probationary service terminated March 31, 1921.

Austin A. O'Toole, building inspector, appointed June 3, 1921.

Theodore W. Souther, appointed building inspector (construction engineer), June 1, 1921.

Russell J. Rice, appointed building inspector (construction engineer), July 1, 1921.

James G. Bolles, appointed plumbing inspector, October 1, 1921.

Timothy F. Dugan, constable, died, November 4, 1921.

David Pickett, appointed constable, December 8, 1921.

Licenses Issued to Operate Elevators for the Year 1921.

PASSENGER ELEVATORS.

New licenses	1,215
Renewals	3,001
Total	4,216

FREIGHT ELEVATORS.

New licenses	202
Renewals	198
Total	400

Total number of licenses granted 4,616

SEX OF LICENSEES.

	PASSENGER ELEVATOR.		FREIGHT ELEVATOR.	
	Male.	Female.	Male.	Female.
New licenses.....	991	224	202	
Renewals.....	2,340	661	198	
Totals.....	3,331	885	400	

LICENSES REFUSED.

	Under 18 Yrs. of Age.	Inexperi- enced.
Passenger	6	16
Freight	1	2
Totals	7	18

Applications abandoned:

Passenger, 22. Freight, 2.

Duplicate licenses issued, 27.

SUMMARY FOR YEAR.

Total number of licenses granted	4,616
Licenses refused	25
Applications abandoned	24
Duplicate licenses issued	27
Total number of documents acted upon	4,692

ELEVATORS.

For the year ending December 31, 1921, the following new installations have been made and approved:

Passenger elevators:

Steam	0	
Electric	71	
Hydraulic	1	
	—	72
Escalator		0
Box conveyors		1

Freight elevators:

Steam	0	
Electric	55	
Hydraulic	11	
	—	66

Dumb waiters	37	
Hand hoists	2	
	—	39

Grand total		178
-----------------------	--	-----

The total number of elevators in this city December 31, 1921, is as follows:

Passenger elevators	3,698	
Freight elevators	5,238	
Hand elevators	1,298	
Hand hoists	879	
	—	11,113

ELEVATOR EXAMINATIONS.

General examinations	7,472	
Accident examinations	54	
Special examinations — complaints filed	934	
Examinations on letters received	393	
Elevators tested (safety device)	2,778	
Investigation of elevator operators (buildings covered)	1,474	
	—	

Total examinations		13,105
------------------------------	--	--------

Complaints made	934	
Accident reports filed	54	
Complaints closed	934	
Permits issued for use of elevators	774	
Applicants examined for license to operate elevators	1,171	

Tests of elevators:

Unsatisfactory	289
Condemned	89
10.25 per cent of elevators tested failed on test.	

Four hundred and five persons found operating elevators without being licensed during the year 1921.

ELEVATORS ABOLISHED THROUGH BUILDINGS TORN DOWN,
REPLACEMENT, ETC.

Electric passenger	1
Electric freight	12
Steam passenger	0
Steam freight	1
Hydraulic passenger	16
Hydraulic freight	5
Hand hoist	1
Dumb-waiters	8
Total	<u>44</u>

AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER INSPECTIONS, ETC.

Applications approved	155
Applications not approved	18
Plans examined	247
Revision of plans required	18
Installations completed in 1921	134
Installations progressing	21
Abandoned	3

CLASS AND TYPE OF BUILDINGS EQUIPPED.

Buildings (first-class)	17
Buildings (second-class)	130
Buildings (third-class)	8
Estimated cost, \$440,000.	

EXAMINATIONS, ETC.

Examinations on sprinklers	1,870
--------------------------------------	-------

PURPOSE OF BUILDINGS.

Mercantile	67
Tenement houses	41
Manufacturing	14
All others	33

DILAPIDATED BUILDINGS.

Number of dilapidated buildings taken down from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921, 231, at an estimated cost of \$35,565.

Number of dilapidated buildings repaired, 85, at an estimated cost of \$22,000.

Number of examinations made, 2,137.

Number of reports filed, 268.

The city took down four buildings at no cost to city. Wreckers took the material in payment.

OWNERSHIP OF DILAPIDATED BUILDINGS.

The ownerships and the addresses of same, of dilapidated buildings, are often very difficult to determine and in some cases it has been found impossible, so that this department, with permission from the Mayor, has had to enter and secure the premises. This step is not taken, however, until a thorough and exhaustive search has been made in the Assessors' department and the Registry of Deeds to ascertain the ownership.

In about seventy per cent of cases where ownerships have been secured finally, it was found that the property had been transferred several times, or ownership denied, which necessitated additional personal interviews and caused delay in serving notices of complaint on the responsible person. It has taken weeks in certain instances to find the correct ownership of several of the buildings under inspection.

**Inventory of Furniture. Property of Public Buildings Department
in Use in Office of Building Department, January 1, 1922.**

91 Chairs.

22 Flat top desks.

10 Roll top desks.

7 Plan tables.

17 Four-section bookcases.

4 Wooden cases, containing 110 document holders.

4 Large wooden cases, containing 20 holders.

4 Steel cases, card index, containing 34 holders.

2 Wooden cases for permits.

8 Wooden cases, double.

1 Wooden case, 4 drawers.

5 Wooden cases, 84 drawers.

4 Single cases, 1 drawer.

2 Wooden cases, 48 drawers.

- 1 Wooden case, 21 drawers.
- 4 Wooden cases, 6 drawers.
- 3 Wooden cases, 4 drawers, long index.
- 4 Steel cases, 16 drawers, large, bill and letter file.
- 1 Wooden case, 2 drawers, for book index.
- 1 Wooden case, 4 drawers, long.
- 2 Wooden closets, for letter press.
- 1 Wooden stand.
- 6 Clocks.
- 8 Counters.
- 2 Plan filing cases.
- 1 Water tank.
- 2 Atlas cases.
- 52 Clothes lockers.
- 4 Double desks.
- 1 Gas pressure machine.
- 1,712 Steel document filing holders.
- 21 Steel cases for the above.
- 5 Tables.
- 15 Telephones.
- 8 Interoffice telephones.
- 1 Bench.
- 9 Stools.
- 4 Drawing table tops.
- 9 Portable electric lamps.
- 65 Record cases.
- 1 Long counter.
- 25 Waste baskets.
- 1 Combination book, index and filing case.
- 1 Clothes tree.
- 1 Double counter.
- 1 Case, 9 drawers.
- 2 Steel cases, 10 drawers each.

Table Showing the Monthly Expenditures of the Department.

DRAFT.	Transfer.	Appropriations.	Monthly Draft.	Total Expenditures.	Unexpended Balance.
1921.					
February 1.....			\$5,888 08		
March 1.....			13,661 80	\$19,549 88	
April 1.....			13,704 31	33,254 19	
May 1.....		\$197,720 29	15,883 47	49,137 66	\$148,582 63
June 1.....	\$694 45	198,414 74	13,903 84	63,041 50	135,373 24
July 1.....			14,062 28	77,103 78	121,310 96
August 1.....			16,999 09	94,102 87	104,311 87
September 1.....			14,860 41	108,963 28	89,451 46
October 1.....			14,875 51	123,838 79	74,575 95
November 1.....			16,648 78	140,487 57	57,927 17
December 1.....			14,467 49	154,955 06	43,459 68
1922.					
January 1.....	600		19,658 49	174,613 55	23,801 19
January 31.....			8,927 12	183,540 67	14,874 07

Classification of Fees.

Charged for examining plans, drawings, and applications in connection with permits being granted for same.

First-class buildings	\$25 00
Second-class buildings	20 00
Third-class buildings	15 00
Alterations:	
Major, over \$500	5 00
Minor, under \$500	1 00
Plumbing:	
New	5 00
Old	1 00
Gasfitting:	
New	1 00
Old	25
Gas fitters' licenses:	
Master	2 00
Journeyman	50
Elevator operator licenses:	
Freight	1 00
Passenger	1 00
Renewals of same	50
Install new elevators.	5 00
Alteration of elevators	1 00
Dumb-waiters	1 00

Statement of Estimates, Appropriations, Expenditures and Income for the Fiscal Year February 1, 1921, to January 31, 1922, Inclusive, and for the Five Preceding Fiscal Years.

GROUP AND ITEM.	EXPENDITURES.									
	1915-16.	1916-17.	1917-18.	1918-19.	1919-20.	1920-21.	1921-22.			
A. PERSONAL SERVICE	\$126,548 00	\$134,109 86	\$141,729 02	\$142,512 98	\$139,619 30	\$158,961 76	\$170,041 38			
1. Permanent employees	\$126,542 10	\$134,113 08	\$141,712 02	\$142,470 80	\$139,619 30	\$158,961 76	\$170,043 38			
3. Unassigned .	6 00	86 78	17 00	42 18						
B. SERVICE OTHER THAN PERSONAL	6,200 57	5,331 94	3,506 89	4,287 99	8,342 03	6,359 35	8,761 94			
1. Printing and binding	382 73	959 46	79 09	68 43	2,811 66	39 25	2,067 05			
2. Postage	536 26	592 34	433 87	504 90	349 45	402 91	337 81			
3. Advertising and posting										
4. Transportation of persons	1,783 58	1,668 38	1,480 14	1,452 83	2,377 35	2,733 87	2,896 28			
10. Rent							5 00			
11. Insurance.	256 00	148 55								
12. Premium on surety bond	35 00	20 00	20 00	20 00	20 00	20 00	20 00			
13. Communication	38 72	99 66	27 84	30 48	35 00	53 17	50 00			
14. Motor vehicles care and repairs	1,815 97	996 00	687 43	1,324 82	800 62	1,142 01	1,073 47			
26. Protective and preventive	607 87	307 50	160 00	525 51	196 62	432 67	533 00			
27. Testing materials and supplies		78 00	55 00	13 00			25 00			
28. Expert and architect			151 00							
29. Stenographic and copying	32 29	5 00	158 17		1,366 40	1,171 20	141 00			
35. Fees, service of venires, etc	7 40	32 00	60 00	22 00	37 00	30 00	32 00			
37. Photographic and blueprinting	343 17	213 80	157 05	168 43	111 98	149 64	275 15			
39. General plant	361 67	210 65	126 71	157 59	145 95	184 03	88 18			
C. EQUIPMENT	2,104 04	932 79	1,175 69	3,842 18	2,701 41	3,486 64	896 49			
4. Motor vehicles	2,001 47	592 59	861 04	3,001 48	2,138 98	3,188 88	256 58			
9. Office	91 28	346 20	130 05	804 20	524 93	297 75				
10. Library			136 00	36 50	37 50		44 50			
13. Tools and instruments							95 40			
16. Wearing apparel	11 32		18 00							
17. General plant			30 00							
D. SUPPLIES	3,152 48	3,720 06	2,993 70	2,711 96	3,844 54	4,364 49	4,336 86			
1. Office	2,613 39	3,117 05	2,319 29	2,007 92	3,154 04	3,323 50	3,168 35			
11. Motor vehicles	539 09	603 01	674 41	703 98	690 50	909 15	868 51			
16. General plant						131 84				
E. SPECIAL ITEMS	900 00	622 50								
7. Pensions and annuities.	900 00	622 50								
Totals .	\$138,905 19	\$144,807 15	\$149,495 30	\$153,355 05	\$154,507 28	\$173,172 24	\$188,546 07			

ESTIMATE, APPROPRIATIONS, INCOME.

	1915-16.	1916-17.	1917-18.	1918-19.	1919-20.	1920-21.	1921-22.
Estimated expenditure	\$153,175 00	\$160,169 55	\$160,183 55	\$169,041 03	\$177,293 62	\$191,720 24	\$195,188 25
Appropriation....	140,500 00	149,493 87	157,483 54	155,848 49	166,210 32	191,995 34	198,414 74
Income covered into City Treasury, fees, etc.	58,265 00	49,206 50	27,147 75	15,930 25	26,656 00	26,390 35	29,700 50

Annual Report and Accounting for All Documents with Fees and All Moneys Received by the Building Department from February 1, 1921, to February 1, 1922.

	1921.																								1922.		Total Documents	Total Fees
	FEBRUARY.		MARCH		APRIL		MAY		JUNE.		JULY.		AUGUST		SEPTEMBER		OCTOBER		NOVEMBER		DECEMBER		JANUARY					
	Documents.	Fees.	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees	Documents	Fees				
Brick	13	\$114 00	31	\$184 00	45	\$193 00	65	\$253 00	74	\$347 00	66	\$270 00	84	\$501 00	74	\$246 00	97	\$439 00	98	\$466 00	63	\$441 00	33	\$191 00	741	\$3,645 00		
Wood	13	55 00	34	202 00	39	141 00	73	395 00	66	420 00	62	535 00	63	405 00	75	495 00	61	599 00	73	563 00	49	355 00	25	219 00	663	4,504 00		
Alterations	254	435 00	457	701 00	582	897 00	631	924 00	578	870 00	663	1,007 00	790	1,210 00	603	954 00	667	1,019 00	459	755 00	355	683 00	264	512 00	1,393	9,967 00		
Heating	36	36 00	25	25 00	29	29 00	27	27 00	48	48 00	36	36 00	55	55 00	59	59 00	59	59 00	81	84 00	52	52 00	59	59 00	569	569 00		
Plumbing, old	145	145 00	183	183 00	171	171 00	238	238 00	228	228 00	186	186 00	244	244 00	211	211 00	182	182 00	174	174 00	159	159 00	152	152 00	2,273	2,273 00		
Plumbing, new	1	30 00	13	65 00	16	80 00	18	90 00	22	110 00	32	160 00	42	210 00	54	270 00	41	205 00	40	200 00	38	190 00	29	145 00	351	1,755 00		
Gasfitting, old	326	81 50	385	96 25	509	127 25	720	180 00	950	237 50	1,062	265 50	702	190 50	840	210 00	1,097	274 25	1,241	310 25	1,201	300 25	695	173 75	9,788	2,447 00		
Gasfitting, new	24	24 00	29	29 00	39	39 00	50	50 00	76	76 00	68	68 00	76	76 00	70	70 00	62	62 00	51	81 00	46	46 00	42	42 00	663	663 00		
Gasfitters' licenses (masters)	1	2 00	1	2 00	2	4 00	3	6 00			3	6 00	3	6 00	1	2 00	2	4 00	1	2 00	2	4 00			19	38 00		
Gasfitters' licenses (journeymen)	2	1 00	4	2 00	2	1 00			2	1 00	2	1 00	2	1 00	4	2 00			4	2 00	5	2 50	5	2 50	32	16 00		
Passenger elevator licenses	111	111 00	114	114 00	116	116 00	101	101 00	114	114 00	98	98 00	108	108 00	118	118 00	87	87 00	75	75 00	66	66 00	98	98 00	1,206	1,206 00		
Freight elevator licenses	17	17 00	21	21 00	9	9 00	20	20 00	21	21 00	10	10 00	13	13 00	14	14 00	20	20 00	13	13 00	7	7 00	16	16 00	181	181 00		
Passenger elevator licenses (out of town)	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50					1	50			1	50	2	1 00					8	4 00		
Freight elevator licenses (out of town)									1	50															1	50		
Passenger elevator licenses (fee waived)	1												1		2		1								5			
Freight elevator license (fee waived)																												
Passenger elevator licenses (duplicate)	5	2 50	3	1 50	2	1 00	4	2 00	3	1 50	1	50	3	1 50			2	1 00	1	50	1	50	6	3 00	31	15 50		
Passenger elevator licenses (renewals)	176	88 00	205	102 50	150	75 00	176	88 00	235	117 50	267	133 50	254	127 00	240	120 00	245	122 50	169	84 50	106	200 00	507	253 50	3,024	1,512 00		
Freight elevator licenses (renewals)	15	7 50	10	5 00	7	3 50	9	4 50	6	3 00	14	7 00	4	2 00	17	8 50	8	4 00	9	4 50	13	6 50	19	9 50	131	65 50		
Building law books		18 00		12 00		6 00														20 00		210 00		318 00		614 00		
Gasfitting law books				2 50		2 25											5 00		2 75		2 50					15 00		
Passenger elevator licenses renewals (fee waived)	2		1		2				4		2		1		1		3		1		15		14		46			
Freight elevator licenses renewals (fee waived)									1						1										2			
Foundation only	2	10 00	1	5 00					4	20 00	4	20 00	9	45 00	7	35 00	5	25 00	1	5 00	2	10 00	4	20 00	39	195 00		
Sale of plates				3 00		4 00												4 00		1 00		3 00				15 00		
Totals	1,150	\$1,178 00	1,518	\$1,756 25	1,721	\$1,899 50	2,136	\$2,370 00	2,433	\$2,615 00	2,576	\$2,803 50	2,515	\$3,285 50	2,481	\$2,819 50	2,670	\$3,110 00	2,524	\$2,841 75	2,474	\$2,768 25	1,908	\$2,244 25	26,166	\$29,700 50		
Deposited with City Collector		1,092 50		1,727 00		1,949 25		2,288 00		2,386 75		3,010 50		\$3,204 50		\$2,688 00		\$3,272 50		\$2,923 75		\$2,838 00		\$2,319 75		\$29,700 50		
Balance carried		85 50		114 75		65 00		156 00		384 25		177 25		\$258 25		\$389 75		\$227 25		\$145 25		\$75 50						

January 1, 1922.			January 1, 1921.		
TITLE.	Number of Employees.	Salaries.	TITLE.	Number of Employees.	Salaries.
Building Commissioner.....	1	\$6,000 00	Building Commissioner.....	1	\$5,000 00
Clerk of Department.....	1	3,100 00	Clerk of Department.....	1	3,100 00
Supervisor of construction.....	1	3,000 00	Supervisor of construction.....	1	3,000 00
Supervisor of construction.....	1	2,800 00	Supervisor of construction.....	1	2,800 00
Supervisor of construction (elevators)...	1	2,500 00	Supervisor of construction (elevators)...	1	2,500 00
Supervisor of plumbing.....	1	2,300 00	Supervisor of plumbing.....	1	2,300 00
Supervisor of gasfitting.....	1	2,300 00	Supervisor of gasfitting.....	1	2,300 00
Building inspector (construction engineers).	2	5,400 00	Building inspectors (construction engineers).	3	8,100 00
Building inspectors (construction engineers).	2	4,800 00	Building inspector (construction engineer).	1	2,400 00
Building inspector.....	1	2,300 00	Building inspector.....	1	2,300 00
Building inspector.....	1	2,200 00	Building inspector.....	1	2,200 00
Building inspectors.....	19	39,900 00	Building inspectors.....	19	39,900 00
Plumbing inspector.....	1	2,300 00	Plumbing inspector.....	1	2,300 00
Plumbing inspectors.....	11	23,100 00	Plumbing inspectors.....	10	21,000 00
Gas fitting inspectors.....	9	18,000 00	Gasfitting inspectors.....	9	18,000 00
Gas fitting inspector.....	1	1,600 00	Elevator inspectors.....	10	18,000 00
Elevator inspectors.....	10	19,000 00	Clerks <i>et al</i>	23	33,900 00
Clerks <i>et al</i>	23	35,300 00			
Totals.....	87	\$175,900 00	Totals.....	85	\$169,100 00

NOTE.— Building inspectors assigned to Egress Division, 5.
 Building inspectors assigned to Fence Viewing, 2.
 Building inspectors assigned to Plan Division, 5 — 4 of whom rate as construction engineers.
 Building inspectors assigned to Construction Division, 11.
 Building inspector assigned to Special Division of Dilapidated Buildings, 1.
 Gas fitting inspector assigned to Egress Division, 1.
 Building inspectors assigned to application desk, 2.
 Gas fitting inspector assigned to Egress Division, 1.
 The above assignments are as of January 1, 1922.

NEW LEGISLATION WHICH BECAME EFFECTIVE
DURING THE YEAR 1921, AFFECTING THE CON-
STRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS
IN THE CITY OF BOSTON AND THE SECURITY
OF LIFE THEREIN.

Chapter 109.—An Act Exempting Certain Buildings in the City of Boston from the Laws Relative to Fire Protection in Stables for Horses and Mules.

Chapter 137.—An Act to Establish Harbor Lines in South Bay in the City of Boston.

Chapter 298.—An Act Relative to the Operation of Elevators by Minors.

GENERAL LAWS.

Chapter 4, Section 7.—Definitions, Statutes, Meaning of Certain Words in Construing Same.

Chapter 49, Section 21.—Spite Fences in Excess of Six Feet in Height.

Chapter 82, Section 37.—Building Lines.

Chapter 83, Section 5.—Storm Water, Separate System of Plumbing.

Chapter 85, Sections 8 and 9.—Signs and Other Obstructions Projecting in Ways.

Chapter 139, Sections 1 and 3.—Common Nuisances, Burnt or Dangerous Buildings.

Chapter 140, Sections 33, 35, 38, 39.—Licenses, Public Lodging Houses.

Chapter 142.—Supervision of Plumbing.

Chapter 143.—Inspection, Regulation and Licenses for Building Elevators and Cinematographs.

Chapter 148.—Fire Protection.

Chapter 149, Section 126.—Doors Not to be Locked During Working Hours in Operative Buildings.

Chapter 184, Section 15.—General Provisions Relating to Real Property Proceedings Affecting Title to Real Property Binding on Third Parties.

Chapter 272, Section 86.—Stables, Exits and Sprinklers.

WAIVERS OF GARAGE REGULATIONS BY STATE FIRE MARSHAL.

There were 469 waivers from January 1, 1921, to December 31 (inclusive), 1921.

REPORT OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS.

BOSTON, April 1, 1922.

MR. HERBERT A. WILSON,

Building Commissioner:

DEAR SIR,—In compliance with your request, the Board of Examiners submits herewith the report of the activities of the department during the year 1921:

During the year the Board held 110 meetings. The work of recalling all licenses issued prior to September 22, 1920, begun on that date, continued throughout the year. In May, 1922, Mr. John F. Hickey was re-elected chairman.

Up to December 31, 1921, 3,400 holders of the original issue of license had been called before the Board. Each of these was instructed as to his responsibility on the work; where complaint had been received from the Building Department, or where there was doubt of a man's ability to control work in each of the classes in which he had held license, examination was given, and only to those who qualified were the various classes re-issued. Each successful applicant was requested to secure a copy of the Building Law and to carry on his building operations according to its intent. In addition, the Board acted upon over 400 applications for new licenses. Those who, after examination, failed to qualify were assisted in the study of subjects recommended by the Board, a number taking advantage of the opportunities afforded by the opening of classes in building supervision at Franklin Union and Wentworth Institute, the directors of these courses working in co-operation with the Board. The number of special licenses was confined to slightly more than 900, the Board thus carrying out its plan of curtailing the abuse of that privilege which is now limited to minor and emergency operations.

In October, 1921, section 5 of chapter 10 of the Ordinances of 1920 was amended so as to require the personal supervision of a licensed mechanic on each building operation and to prohibit unlicensed persons having charge of work. Because of the enforcement of this and the other recent amendments to the ordinance con-

cerning the control of building operations, the Board feels that we have, in Boston, a class of competent superintendents who, because of their training and experience as well as their willingness to co-operate, assure us of proper completion of all work. These changes have met with the approval of builders, architects and engineers throughout the city, and they have expressed a desire to be of assistance in the further prevention of accident during the construction period. The inspectors of the Building Department report a general improvement in the class of men taking charge of building operations, and it is with the aid of the former that the Board is kept in personal touch with the licensees. Reports from the Building Department regarding the practical ability of applicants are carefully considered in the issue of license, and complaints result in prosecution and penalty.

The following is a summary of cases acted upon during the year 1921:

CLASS.	APPLICATIONS.		Total.
	Approved.	Unapproved.	
A.....	689	112	
B.....	1,257	87	
C.....	1,446	19	
D.....	132		
E.....	201	5	
F.....	98	7	
	3,823	230	4,053
Special licenses.....			953
Complaints.....			11
Total.....			5,017

Fees collected in January, 1921 (not included in last year's report)	\$705 00
Fees collected from February 1, 1921, to February 1, 1922	8,479 00
	<u>\$9,184 00</u>

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN F. HICKEY, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF FENCE VIEWERS.

BOSTON, February 1, 1922.

MR. HERBERT A. WILSON,
Building Commissioner:

DEAR SIR,— Following our usual custom we submit herewith our annual report for the year of 1921, as fence viewers for the City of Boston.

From January 1, 1921, to January 1, 1922, we have had 33 cases to consider, of which orders were issued to build partition fences in 24 cases and in 9 cases no orders were issued. The cases are as follows: 2 in Boston proper, 4 in Charlestown, 1 in East Boston, 6 in South Boston, 12 in Dorchester, 3 in Roxbury, 0 in Mattapan, 0 in Jamaica Plain, 3 in Brighton, 2 in Hyde Park.

Since January 1, 1921, we have collected the sum of \$56. There is now due us in unpaid fees for the past ten years the sum of \$205.80. To this amount the sum of \$42 is to be added for unpaid fees for the year 1921. Total in unpaid fees, \$247.80.

Year after year we have recommended that the existing laws pertaining to fences be amended to fit the needs of the City of Boston, and as usual, no one seems interested enough in fence viewing laws to take the matter before the Legislature for amendment. On February 28, 1921, we called the attention of his Honor the Mayor to this matter by letter, and received an answer March 1, 1921, from the Mayor's secretary stating that the matter would be taken up with the Corporation Counsel at once. The following is a copy of the letter sent:

BOSTON, February 28, 1921.

HON. ANDREW J. PETERS,
Mayor of the City of Boston:

SIR,— On March 1, 1911, chapter 76, Acts of 1911, became a law, wherein the Mayor of Boston was empowered to designate two building inspectors of the Building Department of the City of Boston to act as fence viewers for the said city, in accordance with chapter 33, Revised Laws of Massachusetts.

The fees for fence viewing according to law is \$2 a day for such time as may be required to settle the dispute at hand, and are to be apportioned and collected by the fence viewers and paid to the City Treasurer. In the past ten years the accumulation of unpaid fees amounts to \$205.80, or an average of \$20.58 a year.

The fence viewers have no means of collecting from delinquent parties, other than an action in tort. For a number of years we have sent the names of the parties who did not pay their share of our fee to the Law Department for collection. In order to collect by law, it would cost the city thirty or forty dollars to get \$2 in each particular case. For this reason we have had no encouragement to take legal action in tort against the parties.

We feel that at some future date some committee of investigation might wish to hold us accountable for these unpaid fees. Therefore, we appeal to you for advice in this matter, and offer for your consideration the following recommendations:

1. That the existing laws be amended, on division fences, to fit the needs of the City of Boston.

2. That a law be enacted that will definitely empower the fence viewers with sufficient authority to settle disputes continually arising over maintenance of embankment walls on division lines and to have their decision final and binding on the parties in dispute without unnecessary resort to the courts, and at an unnecessary expense to the disputants.

3. That a law be enacted that will empower the fence viewers to collect their fees in some way other than an action in tort; or that the present fee system be abolished; or that chapter 76, Acts of 1911, be repealed.

Inasmuch as many cases are over the true boundary line, where a surveyor has to be called to survey the surrounding premises to establish the true line, we would recommend that the fence viewers be selected from the engineers of the Street Laying-Out Department instead of from the inspectors of the Building Department.

Yours very truly,

JOHN J. DUNIGAN,
CORNELIUS MURPHY,
Fence Viewers.

The following letter from the Mayor's secretary was received March 1, 1921:

BOSTON, March 1, 1921.

MR. JOHN J. DUNIGAN:

DEAR SIR,— As the Mayor is away from the office I am acknowledging to you as the first signer the receipt of your letter of February 28.

This is a matter on which he would undoubtedly like to have the advice of the Corporation Counsel and I am, therefore, sending your letter to him for his opinion as to what course should be followed.

Very truly yours,

E. V. B. PARKE,
Secretary to the Mayor.

The following is a copy of letter from Corporation Counsel Arthur D. Hill to the Mayor's secretary:

BOSTON, March 3, 1921.

E. V. B. PARKE, Esq.,
Secretary to the Mayor:

DEAR SIR,— Your letter of 1st March, inclosing letter from the fence viewers, is received, in which you ask my advice as to what is to be done. My advice in the matter would be to propose some legislation by the next General Court with a view to amending the law on division fences, to providing for the decision of disputes on embankment walls, and to take charge of the question of fees. It is, however, impossible to introduce such legislation prior to the General Court of 1922 and I, therefore, suggest that the matter be allowed to lie until the summer, with the understanding that it should then be taken up and legislation prepared.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR D. HILL,
Corporation Counsel.

Most cases, where we have been asked to intervene, should not have been called to our attention at all, as invariably the fence question is a secondary matter and is generally involved in a neighborhood quarrel, many times of such magnitude as to make it impossible for any Board of Fence Viewers to reach an amicable adjustment of the fence in question.

Therefore, we would suggest that a new law pertaining to Division line fences should be enacted which would give the Board of Fence Viewers the power to summons property owners adjacent to and within a reasonable distance from the fence in dispute, to give them a fair chance to protest against an unsightly fence built to annoy the neighborhood rather than protection of property, built to the street line of some of our finest residential districts.

The present laws pertaining to division fences are not adaptable to any city in the Commonwealth, much less the largest city, Boston, and after our past eleven years' experience trying to apply these laws to numerous cases we have had to adjust, we earnestly recommend that a new law be enacted and that chapter 49, General Laws, and chapter 76, Acts of 1911, be repealed.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN J. DUNIGAN,
CORNELIUS J. MURPHY,
Fence Viewers for City of Boston.

REPORT OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF GAS FITTERS.

Boston, January 1, 1922.

In compliance with chapter 265 of the Acts of 1897 the Board of Examiners of Gas Fitters held monthly examinations from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921, with the following results:

Number of applications referred to the Board of Examiners by the Building Commissioner	219
Number of examinations held	12
Number of applicants examined	163
Masters	36
Journeymen	127
Number who passed the examination and were certified by the Board of Examiners to the Building Commissioner for license	51
Masters	19
Journeymen	32
Number of examination papers rejected, applicants not having the required percentage	112
Masters	17
Journeymen	95

Respectfully submitted,

HERBERT A. WILSON, *Chairman*,
WILLIAM C. WOODWARD,
GEORGE W. COMERFORD,
Board of Examiners.

Summary of Accidents in, to or upon Buildings Where Injury to Persons or Fatalities Have Occurred, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.

Date. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Nature of Accident.	Persons Injured.		Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.	
Feb. 9.....	104 Portland street.....	5	A gas-fired steam vulcanizer exploded because of some undetermined defect in the mechanism. The operator of the vulcanizer was severely injured. The roof of the building was lifted out of place and a portion of the rear wall was so damaged that it will have to be rebuilt.		1	
April 14.....	48 Holborn street.....	16	Child while leaping against railing of piazza fell to ground, a distance of about eighteen feet and received severe injuries about the head. Our inspector found the railing and balusters to be in loose and in need of repairs.		1	Owner of property notified to have piazza and its appurtenances put in a safe condition.
Aug. 29.....	37 and 39 Piedmont street, corner of 58-62 Church street.....	5	A derrick of the gin pole type collapsed and caused four workmen to fall from the second floor to the basement. The workmen were engaged in erecting a column on the second floor, and the underpinning of the derrick was not strong enough to sustain the combined weight of the derrick and the column.		4	
Sept. 14.....	44 Columbus avenue.....	8	A five-light gas meter located on the side wall of a storage battery repair shop exploded, going through a plate glass window and injuring two pedestrians. The meter supplied a gas stove and a hose cock; the cock had attached to it a hose which supplied gas to a torch. The torch had a branch which was connected to a calcium tank; the tank had a maximum pressure of 225 pounds. It is believed that the valve on the calcium tank was left open which allowed an excess pressure to enter the meter.		2	The meter has been removed and the gas is not in use. This department has recommended that a relief or back pressure valve be installed on the illuminating gas line.

Summary of Accidents in, to or upon Buildings, Showing the
Number of Accidents, Number of Persons Concerned and
the Results as Reported to this Department, January 1, 1921,
to December 31, 1921.

Number of cases investigated	4
Number of accidents	4
Number of persons injured	8
Fatal	—
Nonfatal	8

Statement of Accidents in, to or upon Elevators, etc., from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Nature of Accident.	PERSONS INJURED.		Date of Last Examination.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
Jan. 5.....	77 Bedford street.....	5	Belt of freight car came off which caused car to slide to bottom of pit. Teamster riding on car was thrown to bottom of floor.		1	Aug. 6, 1919.	
Jan. 5.....	149 Blackstone street....	5	Employee, 17 years of age, caught between car platform of freight elevator and shaft-way.		1	Dec. 29, 1920.	Circumstances of accident unknown.
Jan. 10.....	140 Tremont street.....	5	Employee had head crushed between car platform of passenger elevator and top of tenth floor landing. Licensed operator started to close door when victim pulled open door and attempted to enter elevator.	1		July 10, 1920.	Operator's license was suspended pending an investigation. Inquest report places blame equally upon operator and victim of accident.
Jan. 12.....	564 Washington street....	5	Employee fell down shaftway of freight elevator; he failed to notice that car was not at landing.		1	Feb. 2, 1920.	Equipment was found to be defective and the further use of elevator has been prohibited.
Jan. 13.....	450 Washington street....	5	Employee caught between car platform of passenger elevator and wall of well-way when he attempted to leave car. Car was being operated from the machine room.		1	Oct. 13, 1920.	Letter sent to superintendent that the cars must be operated only by car switch.
Jan. 19.....	450 Washington street....	5	Employee fell between car platform of freight elevator and top of basement landing.		1	Jan. 14, 1920.	
Jan. 21.....	105 Washington street....	5	Expressman while taking up a box on freight elevator stood on top of ash can in order to keep box clear of counterweight. He was unable to clear the counterweight, the box was thrown back and broke the man's spine, which caused instant death.	1		Feb. 26, 1920.	Car was found to be in good condition.

Feb. 8.....	888 Washington street...	5	Man found in pit of freight elevator shaftway. Circumstances of accident unknown.		1	Nov. 10, 1920.
Feb. 24.....	35 Congress street.....	5	Passenger elevator failed to stop at landing and went on bumpers.		4	Nov. 1, 1920.
Mar. 12.....	30 Huntington avenue...	7	Female tenant, 65 years of age, fell from second floor to bottom of pit of passenger well-way. Watchman was operating elevator and claims he left the door of second floor landing closed.	1		Oct. 3, 1919.
Mar. 16.....	33 Purchase street.....	5	Employee caught his finger in shipper rope lock of freight elevator.		1	April 7, 1917.
Mar. 17.....	30-38 Winter street.....	5	Passenger car with twelve persons fell from second floor and descended on automatics to basement. The operator lost control of car when the main valve rod broke.		12	Feb. 17, 1920.
Mar. 18.....	105-113 Summer street...	5	Hoist ropes of passenger elevator broke allowing car to fall to bumpers. The accident happened while the car was near the first floor landing and as there was not enough distance between pit and floor landing the safety devices failed to operate.		6	Nov. 13, 1920.
April 1.....	15 School street.....	5	Descending passenger car struck piece of door frame carpenter was working on at fifth floor landing. The carpenter was thrown to the floor and received slight injuries.		1	Dec. 30, 1920.
April 14.....	294 Washington street...	5	Passenger car operated by licensed female operator stopped at tenth floor to let off passenger. After the car had started for the next floor, one of the passengers said "tenth floor, operator," and started to leave car; car was stopped about 6 inches above floor level and passenger fell to floor receiving slight injuries about her head.		1	Aug. 10, 1919.
April 27.....	212 Summer street.....	5	Expressman was hit in head by descending freight elevator. He was looking down well-way and failed to notice descending elevator.		1	Jan. 11, 1921.

Recommended that machine be relocated so as to overcome back breaking bend in hoist ropes.

Statement of Accidents in, to or upon Elevators, etc., from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.— Continued.

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Nature of Accident.	PERSONS INJURED.		Date of Last Examination.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
May 3.....	295-297 Congress street..	5	Operator of passenger elevator left car to turn power on. He neglected to close door and in his absence three girls entered elevator. The car started up and one of the girls jumped off car and in so doing struck her head on top of door frame.		1	Jan. 12, 1921.	The operator failed to leave the shipper rope in neutral position when he left the car.
May 7.....	201 Devonshire street....	5	Night watchman was found on top of passenger elevator car, face downward and his legs inside of car. He had rung in his clock on the eighth floor and failed to notice that elevator was not at the landing.		1	Jan. 12, 1921.	It is believed that some unauthorized person took the car from the eighth floor.
May 23.....	15 State street.....	5	Engineer was struck on shoulder by descending passenger elevator. He had greased the plunger of one elevator and was going into pit of adjacent elevator when he was struck.		1	June 28, 1920.	
May 31.....	72 Broad street.....	5	Errand boy, 15 years of age, had his ankle caught between car platform of freight elevator and second floor beam.		1	Previous to 1917.	
June 20.....	25 Sudbury street.....	5	Employee found crushed between platform of freight elevator and fifth floor threshold.	1		Aug. 3, 1920.	Circumstance of accident unknown.
June 22.....	55 Tremont street.....	5	Passenger car, probably overloaded, started to overspeed and went on safeties.		29	Oct. 27, 1920.	
June 24.....	531 Washington street...	5	Porter had his foot caught between platform of freight elevator and bevel plate at first floor.		1	April 12, 1920.	He was carrying a ladder up on the elevator, the ladder became caught in landing gate which pushed the porter partly off elevator.

July 4.....	45 Bromfield street.....	5	Janitor fell into pit of passenger elevator from basement landing. He failed to notice that elevator was not at the landing.		1	Mar. 18, 1921.	
July 4.....	341 Newbury street.....	8	Employee fell from first floor landing to pit of freight elevator well-way.	1		May 12, 1919.	Circumstances of accident unknown.
July 5.....	55 Congress street.....	5	Operator lost control of passenger car and it slid from first floor to basement.		10	May 13, 1921.	Accident due to defective contact on controller.
July 5.....	16 New street.....	2	Boy, 16 years of age, had his heel caught between top of door frame and platform of freight elevator.		1	Dec. 3, 1920.	
July 25.....	199 State street.....	6	The automatic machine stop broke while the freight elevator was on the down motion. The counterweights were pulled into the overhead machinery, which caused the cables of the counterweight to break.			Sept. 23, 1920.	
July 27.....	294 Harrison avenue.....	6	Child, 7 years of age found dead in pit of freight elevator.	1		Nov. 29, 1920.	No witness to accident.
Aug. 11.....	133 Summer street.....	5	Carpenter while at work back of grill-work near counterweight was struck on head by descending counterweight.		1	April 18, 1921.	The carpenter had been warned by the elevator operator to watch out for the counterweight.
Aug. 23.....	77 Bedford street.....	5	Boy while playing on freight elevator attempted to jump off while it was in motion. He got caught between the car platform and landing floor and injured his ankle.		1	Mch. 11, 1921.	
Sept. 8.....	253 Summer street.....	9	Shipper rope of freight elevator became caught in some manner and parted. The automatic stop on machine slipped and the car went into the overheads, which caused the hoisting cables to break. The car fell to basement.		3	Aug. 5, 1920.	This elevator was tested on August 5, 1920, with three thousand pounds and found O.K.
Sept. 12.....	56 Boylston street.....	5	Employee attempted to enter passenger car while it was in motion. He miscalculated the distance and fell on top of car.		1	April 5, 1921.	
Sept. 14.....	19 Congress street.....	5	Porter while engaged in carrying up supplies on passenger elevator early in the morning got caught between car platform and well-way.	1		Mch. 15, 1920.	There was no witness to accident.

Statement of Accidents in, to or upon Elevators, etc., from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.—Concluded.

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Nature of Accident.	PERSONS INJURED.		Date of Last Examination.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
Sept. 14.....	24-36 Summer street.....	5	Tooth of slack cable device of freight elevator broke, which in turn broke teeth in worm gear.			Feb. 17, 1921.	
Sept. 21.....	59 Temple place.....	5	Choker cable parted while passenger car was on the down motion, which caused car to slide to bottom of pit.		2	Aug. 30, 1920.	Recommended that sheaves be re-arranged so as to avoid sharp turns in cable.
Sept. 30.....	131-141 Beverly street....	5	Porter found wedged in between platform of freight elevator and well-way.	1		Oct. 26, 1920.	Circumstances of accident unknown.
Oct. 18.....	110-114 Lincoln street...	5	Man fell into shaft-way of freight elevator. Our inspector found that light in hall had been removed and that gate on car was defective.		1	Sept. 23, 1921.	
Oct. 18.....	87 Milk street.....	5	Telephone repair man while at work in elevator pit was struck by counterweight.		1	Sept. 15, 1920.	
Oct. 21.....	24 Lincoln street.....	5	Passenger injured while entering car of passenger elevator. She was thrown to floor of car when it suddenly started.		1	Mch. 30, 1921.	
Oct. 25.....	171A Tremont street....	5	Machinist while at work on top of passenger elevator was injured when the car went into the overhead machinery.		1	Oct. 8, 1920.	
Nov. 16.....	22-24 Chardon street....	5	Chauffeur accidentally backed automobile into well-way of freight elevator of garage, and fell three stories.		1		

Nov. 18.....	207-211 Essex street.....	5	Employee had foot caught between platform of freight elevator and wall of well-way.		1	Dec. 10, 1920.
Dec. 5.....	351 Congress street.....	9	Man fell from first floor to basement of shaft-way, of freight elevator. The light in hall-way was missing.		1	Mch. 30, 1921.
Dec. 14.....	34-36 Cambridge street..	5	Employee fell from first floor to basement of freight elevator.		1	
Dec. 17.....	53-55 Temple place.....	5	Operator and stock girl were fooling on passenger elevator. The girl had her foot caught between car and wall of well-way.		1	Dec. 15, 1921.
Dec. 19.....	294 Washington street...	5	Passenger elevator slid from street floor to basement.		1	Jan. 21, 1921.
Dec. 21.....	377 Atlantic avenue.....	5	Employee while reaching in well-way to operate car lost his balance and fell into well-way of freight elevator.		1	
Dec. 29.....	495 Washington street...	5	Employee injured when rope broke on freight elevator. Safeties failed to operate and car went to basement.		1	Sept. 1, 1920.
						Operator immediately discharged by owner of building.
						Recommended that either a new electric elevator be installed or the present elevator be equipped with safety devices and two hoist ropes.

Summary.

KIND OF ELEVATOR.	Number of Accidents.	Number of Persons Injured.	RESULT.	
			Fatal.	Nonfatal.
Passenger.....	23	* 80	3	
Freight.....	26	26	6	20
Totals.....	49	106	9	97

* Fifty-one persons involved in three accidents in which passenger elevators slid to bottom of elevator shaft-way.

There was one death on a passenger elevator in which a licensed operator was held partially responsible.

Summary of Asphyxiations by Illuminating Gas, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Cause of Inspection.	PERSONS AFFECTED		New or Old Installation.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
Jan. 1.....	7 Baldwin place.....	25	Male lodger overcome by escaping gas. Circumstances not known.	1			Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Jan. 3.....	35½ Border street.....	2	Storekeeper accidentally opened key of gas radiator after extinguishing the flame.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Jan. 6.....	97 Broadway.....	8	Lodger despondent because of lack of employment took his own life.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Jan. 7.....	22 Auburn street.....	5	Tenant overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened jet. The key was found to be in a loose condition and it is probable that in extinguishing the light the young man accidentally left the key open.		1	New.	The key has since been tightened.
Jan. 7.....	36 Field street.....	7	Tenant, seventy years of age, overcome by gas which escaped from a tube which became disconnected from a gas stove.		1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in poor condition.
Jan. 7.....	191 Maverick street.....	2	Tenant took his own life.....	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Jan. 17.....	138 Zeigler street.....	12	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from an unit burner. The gas supply came through a prepayment meter and became exhausted while the roomer was in bed. Someone placed a coin in the meter which caused the gas to flow again.		1		On the recommendation of our inspector the prepayment meter has been replaced by a regular one.
Jan. 18.....	917 Blue Hill avenue.....	21	Housewife fifty-three years of age, because of ill-health attempted suicide.		1	New.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.

Summary of Asphyxiations by Illuminating Gas, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.—Continued

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Cause of Inspection.	PERSONS AFFECTED.		New or Old Installation.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
Jan. 19.....	64 Call street.....	22	Lodger sixty-five years of age overcome by the products of combustion of a six-tube radiator and a kerosene lamp. Victim had windows and doors closed, thus cutting off a sufficient supply of air.				Not a gas case.
Jan. 21.....	3 Lothrop place.....	5	Lodger probably took his own life, all fixtures in his room found open.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in a fair condition.
Jan. 21.....	17 Walnut street.....	3	Housewife, fifty-six years of age, while despondent over the death of her son attempted suicide.		1		The gas supply was taken from a prepayment meter and the giving out of the supply saved her life.
Jan. 22.....	Kendall street.....	13	Employee of gas company overcome by gas which escaped from a street main.				Department has no jurisdiction.
Jan. 26.....	41 Middlesex street.....	6	Tenant overcome by gas which entered building from a leak in the street main.				Department has no jurisdiction.
Jan. 26.....	58 Myrtle street.....	8	Lodger (from Maine) eighty-six years of age, out of work and funds, attempted suicide.		1	New.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Jan. 26.....	7 Rockland place.....	16	Gas range exploded, no person was injured. Damage confined to the demolition of range and glass in windows. Range was supplied by a prepayment meter, gas gave out and when a new supply was turned on and was lit, the heat generated exploded the gas that was left in the oven.				

Jan. 28.....	28 Lamont street.....	13	Lodger, sixty years of age, was overcome by gas which escaped from a defective bracket. The stop pin was found to be missing from the cock.	1		A licensed gas fitter has since removed defective bracket and made general repairs.
Jan. 28.....	186 West Brookline street,	7	Female lodger, sixty years of age, was overcome by gas which escaped from an unlit single tube radiator. The woman had recently been discharged from the hospital and was in poor physical condition, and it is believed that she attempted to light the radiator but was unable to do so.	1		
Jan. 29.....	40 Randall street.....	12	Tenant overcome by gas which escaped from a defective fixture.	1		Ordered that defective keys be repaired or replaced and that the supply of gas be shut off until these repairs have been made.
Feb. 3.....	102 Seaver street.....	16	Tenant probably attempted suicide.....		1 New.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Feb. 4.....	18 Pelham street.....	6	Lodger, while despondent, took her own life...	1		Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Feb. 9.....	18 Bowdoin street.....	8	Lodger committed suicide.....	1		Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Feb. 9.....	5 Causeway street.....	5	Lodger unfamiliar with the use of gas blew out the flame and was overcome by the escaping gas.	1		Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Feb. 11.....	22 Milford street.....	6	Lodger, forty-two years of age, took her own life.	1		Fixtures found to be in poor condition.
Feb. 13.....	24 Common street.....	5	Tenant, sixty-seven years of age, was overcome by gas which escaped from a gas tube which had become disconnected from a gas stove.	1		
Feb. 15.....	48 Mt. Vernon street.....	11	Man and wife overcome by gas which escaped from a gas stove. Both of the victims were of advanced age and had lost their sense of smell and therefore were not able to detect the escaping gas.	2		Valves on the range have since been packed and tightened.
Feb. 16.....	31 Porter street.....	2	Tenant attempted to take up a leak in gas range and was overcome by the escaping gas.		1	The range was later connected up with iron piping by a licensed gas fitter.

Summary of Asphyxiations by Illuminating Gas, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.—Continued.

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Cause of Inspection.	PERSONS AFFECTED		New or Old Installation.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
Feb. 17.....	474 Shawmut avenue.....	6	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from a one-light pendant, the cock of which was loose. It is believed that in turning out the light the lodger accidentally opened the cock again.		1	Old.	Ordered that general repairs be made to all gas fixtures and appliances.
Feb. 22.....	10 Lincoln park.....	9	Father and mother and three children overcome by gas which escaped from a defective metal hose, which became detached from a gas stove.	2	3	Old.	Two of the children, aged ten years and four years respectively died from the effects of the gas. Ordered that gas stove be connected up with iron pipe.
Feb. 22.....	49 Newcomb street.....	12	Tenant overcome by gas which escaped from a metallic hose. The cocks and the hose were not gas tight.		1	Old.	Ordered that the use of the metallic hose be discontinued.
Feb. 23.....	215 Hanover street.....	5	Lodger, while under the influence of liquor, accidentally opened gas jet.		1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Feb. 23.....	4 Worcester square.....	6	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from hose cock which supplied a gas heater. The hose became disconnected because of a faulty fit.		1		On recommendation of our inspector the use of the heater has been discontinued.
Feb. 26.....	95 Mercer street.....	10	Housewife overcome by gas which escaped from an improperly lit heater of the "pan" type.		1		Our inspector has had the heater removed.
Mar. 1.....	597 Columbia road.....	11	Lodger, seventy-five years of age, failed to notice that gas was escaping from an unfit section of a gas heater and was overcome by the escaping gas.	1			Radiator has been destroyed on order of our inspector.

Mar. 2.....	158 Tyler street.....	5	Lodger, overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened jet. It is believed that the flame was extinguished by the wind as the light was located near the door. The lodger was in the habit of leaving the gas burning all night.		1		
Mar. 4.....	609 Massachusetts avenue	13	Lodger, overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened burner. It was the habit of the occupant of the room to leave the gas burning with a low flame and it is possible because of condensation in the pipes the flame was put out.		1	Old.	Ordered that meter be relocated and that service pipe be protected against frost.
Mar. 7.....	189 West Broadway.....	9	Lodger, overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened cock which was accidentally left open while extinguishing the flame.		1		Ordered that independent fitting be removed.
Mar. 13.....	1 Ringgold street.....	6	Lodger, while under the influence of liquor, accidentally opened key of fixture and was overcome by the gas which escaped.	1			Our inspector found fixture to be in good condition.
Mar. 14.....	817 East Broadway.....	10	Lodger took his own life.....	1			Ordered that the keys be greased and that the lights be protected by globe holders.
Mar. 14.....	15 Holborn street.....	16	Tenant, eighty-three years of age, accidentally opened cock of gas stove and was overcome by the escaping gas.	1			Ordered that the valves on gas range be packed and tightened.
Mar. 16.....	21 Romsey street.....	11	Housewife, subject to shocks or fits, probably accidentally opened one of the valves of the gas range. She died from the effects of the escaping gas.	1			A new range has been substituted for the old one.
Mar. 17.....	53 Newland street.....	6	Tenant overcome from gas which flowed from a defective gas lamp connected to a defective gas bracket, the arm of which was loose.		1	Old.	Ordered that bracket be repaired or replaced, and that the use of lamp be discontinued until it has been put in a safe condition.
Mar. 23.....	337 Chelsea street.....	2	The clothes of a young lady accidentally caught fire while lighting gas stove.	1		Old.	Ordered that gas stove be connected up with iron pipe.
Mar. 24.....	316 Roxbury street.....	15	Storekeeper overcome by gas which escaped from a small gas stove. This is probably a case of suicide.	1			

Summary of Asphyxiations by Illuminating Gas, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.—Continued.

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Cause of Inspection.	PERSONS AFFECTED		New or Old Instal- lation.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
Mar. 25.....	15 Swallow street.....	10	Youth, eighteen years of age, found overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened gas jet. It is thought that the wind blew out the gas flame.		1		
Mar. 25.....	26 West Dedham street..	6	Lodger, while under the influence of liquor, overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened jet. It is believed that he accidentally opened the key.		1		
Mar. 26.....	1 Robinson street.....	18	Housewife, fifty-four years of age, while despondent, took her own life.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Mar. 27.....	569 River street.....	24	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from a one-light pendant. Circumstances of case not known.	1			Fixture was found to be in good condition.
Mar. 29.....	45 Milford street.....	6	Lodger, without work or funds, took his own life.	1			
Mar. 31.....	37 Lynde street.....	5	Lodger, overcome by gas which escaped from a burner, the key of which had been accidentally opened after extinguishing the light.	1		Old.	Ordered that the gas stove be connected up with iron piping, and that all gas keys be greased and that globe holders be placed over lights.
April 3.....	17 Dwight street.....	6	Lodger, probably under the influence of liquor, accidentally opened gas jet.		1		
April 4.....	484 Tremont street.....	6	Lodger, unfamiliar with the use of gas and under the influence of liquor, accidentally opened cock of a three-light fixture.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.

April 7.....	37 Worcester square.....	6	Lodger, seventy years of age, overcome by gas which escaped from an open burner of a gas stove.		1		Circumstances of accident not known.
April 8.....	66 West Newton street....	6	Lodger committed suicide.....	1			Fixtures found to be in good condition. Our inspector ordered that gas pressure be increased.
April 9.....	661 East Fifth street.....	10	Housewife, overcome by gas which escaped from open fixture in the kitchen. The gas was left burning all night, which burned out all the gas in the prepayment meter. In the morning a coin was placed in the meter which caused the gas to again flow.		1		
April 9.....	83 Windsor street.....	13	Roomer, sixty-five years of age, while turning out light, accidentally opened key of independent fitting to which a gas hose was attached. The gas hose led to an old style radiator from which the gas escaped.		1		Recommended that the use of old style (flashing plate) radiators be prohibited.
April 14.....	155 Worcester street.....	7	Lodger committed suicide.....	1		Old.	Ordered that independent cocks be removed, that the keys be greased, and that a controlling cock be placed on range in kitchen.
April 19.....	127 Tremont street.....	5	Cook left cocks of gas oven open and neglected to light burners. Some time later she attempted to light the burners and a violent explosion occurred and she was severely injured.		1		The oven has been replaced with a new one.
April 21.....	102 Brighton street.....	5	Mother and three children overcome by gas which was accidentally turned on by one of three children.		4		Hose cock has been removed and outlet capped. Gas company has removed a defective by-pass on inverted light in kitchen.
April 22.....	91 Amory street.....	15	Roomer, overcome by gas which escaped from an open gas bracket, the key of which was loose.		1	Old.	Ordered that a defective bracket be replaced with a new one.
April 25.....	64 London street.....	2	Tenant, eighty years of age, accidentally opened key of hose cock.		1		Independent fitting has been removed and stove has been connected up with iron pipe.
April 26.....	11 Dartmouth street.....	7	Roomer, overcome by gas which escaped from defective fixtures. Circumstances of accident unknown.		1	Old.	Ordered that general repairs be made to fixtures.

Summary of Asphyxiations by Illuminating Gas, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.— Continued.

DATE, 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Cause of Inspection.	PERSONS AFFECTED.		New or Old Instal- lation.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
April 27.....	7 Morse street.....	19	Old man, seventy-eight years of age, in poor health committed suicide.	1		Old.	Ordered that all gas keys be greased.
May 1.....	57 Appleton street.....	7	Lodger while despondent took his own life....	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
May 1.....	14 Cooper street.....	5	Lodger and three tenants overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened burner which was accidentally reopened after extinguishing the light.	1	3		Ordered that shelf located under bracket and independent fittings be removed by globe holders.
May 4.....	278 Massachusetts ave....	7	A gas-fired cooking machine exploded, which blew out the plate glass window. No other damage to person or property.		1		Operator who was unfamiliar with the use of the machine allowed too much gas to accumulate before lighting the burner.
May 4.....	23 Newman street.....	11	Lodger accidentally opened gas cock while extinguishing the light.		1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
May 8.....	161 Court street.....	5	Sailor from the U. S. S. "Dakota," evidently under the influence of liquor, accidentally opened the key of fixture after turning off the light.		1	Old.	Ordered that gas stove be connected up with iron pipe and that controlling cock be placed on fixture in front hall.
May 12.....	176½ I street.....	10	Married woman, forty years of age, attempted suicide.		1		Independent fitting has been removed. Ordered that keys on range and in the bathroom be greased.
May 15.....	3 Savage court.....	2	Man and wife overcome by gas which escaped from partly opened burner. The man died; the woman recovered. Circumstances of case not known.	1	1		The gas company has removed the meter. Our inspector has ordered that keys be greased, that new bracket be placed in kitchen and that gas stove be connected up with iron pipe.

May 21.....	80 Berkeley street.....	7	Lodger, eighty-two years of age, attempted suicide.		1		New gas service has since been installed throughout the house.
May 21.....	17 St Charles street.....	7	Female lodger, sixty-five years of age, committed suicide.	1			
May 21.....	748 Tremont street.....	7	Female lodger, fifty-five years of age, attempted suicide.		1		
May 28.....	330 Harrison avenue.....	6	Tenant found lying on the floor overcome by gas which escaped from an open burner. Circumstances of case unknown.		1		Owner has ordered new fixtures to be installed throughout the building.
June 5.....	71 Brooks street.....	26	Female lodger, forty-one years of age, while in poor health, took her own life.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
June 23.....	267 Lamartine street.....	22	Married woman, fifty-eight years of age, attempted suicide.		1	Old.	Ordered that independent fittings be removed and that gas keys be greased.
July 2.....	13 Irving street.....	8	Male lodger, sixty years of age, committed suicide.	1		New.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
July 3.....	24 Hanson street.....	6	Roomer accidentally opened one of the cocks of a two-light pendant fixture and was overcome by the gas which escaped.	1			Ordered that the two-light fixture be replaced by one of a better type, and that the use of a "See Easy" burner be prohibited unless it is provided with an approved pilot.
July 13.....	64 Bowdoin street.....	5	Lodger committed suicide.....	1		New.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
July 27.....	32 Ash street.....	5	Woman, sixty-six years of age, attempted suicide.		1		Our inspector found cock on main service pipe only half turned on; he turned it on fully. Ordered that all gas keys be greased.
July 29.....	25 Norway street.....	7	Female tenant, forty-eight years of age, attempted suicide.		1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
July 30.....	56 Sherman street.....	16	Married woman, thirty-six years of age, attempted suicide. This was her third attempt.		1	Old.	Ordered that gas stove be connected up with iron pipe and that all gas keys be greased.
Aug. 6.....	443 Shawmut avenue.....	6	Leak in street main exploded and blew out foundation wall.				Department has no jurisdiction.
Aug. 15.....	12 Farnham street.....	12	Gas oven used in the manufacture of ice cream cones exploded when the gas cock on one of the ovens was carelessly left open.				

Summary of Asphyxiations by Illuminating Gas, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.—Continued.

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Cause of Inspection.	PERSONS AFFECTED		New or Old Instal- lation.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
Aug. 15.....	188 Franklin street.....	5	A lieutenant of the Boston Protective Department injured as the result of a gas explosion. Gas came from a street leak.	...			Department has no jurisdiction.
Aug. 22.....	29 Burrell street.....	12	Tenant noticed odor of gas and attempted to find leak with the aid of a lighted candle. An explosion resulted and the tenant was slightly burned about the face. The gas had escaped from a partly opened cock of a gas stove. No damage was caused to property.		1		
Sept. 1.....	11 Milford street.....	6	Young married woman, thirty years of age, took her life.	1		Old.	Ordered that independent fittings be removed and that all gas keys be greased and that new bracket be installed in room on third floor.
Sept. 2.....	161 Court street.....	5	Lodger took his life.....	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Sept. 5.....	83 Lamartine street.....	15	Woman, eighty-three years of age, overcome by gas which escaped from a cock of a gas stove which had been accidentally left open.	1			
Sept. 11.....	627 Tremont street.....	7	Lodger took his own life.....	1		Old.	Gas fitter has since connected up gas stove with iron pipe and greased all gas keys.
Sept. 15.....	37 Dwight street.....	6	Lodger attempted suicide.....		1	Old.	Ordered that gas stove be connected up with iron pipe and that shield be placed over bracket in cellar.

Sept. 15.....	83 Porter street.	2	Tenant used a lighted candle to locate a gas leak in bathroom and was burnt about the face and hands as the result of a fire which resulted. The gas escaped from a defective pipe in the fixture.	1		Piping and fixtures have been replaced with new stock, retested and found O. K.
Sept. 17.....	16 Upton street.	6	Lodger found overcome by gas which escaped from cock on bracket which had been accidentally left open.	1		Ordered that rubber tubing be replaced with iron piping and that independent fitting be removed.
Sept. 23.....	38 Granger street.	18	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened key of gas bracket. Circumstances seem to indicate that the key was accidentally opened.	1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Sept. 26.....	239 West Newton street..	7	Old lady, seventy-three years of age, accidentally opened key of bracket while striking match to light gas of another fixture in room.	1		General repairs have been made to fixtures throughout building.
Sept. 26.....	133 Federal street.....	5	Baker, overcome by gas, which escaped from an oven. The baker that was on duty before him failed to completely shut off the gas in the oven.	1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Oct. 7.....	135 Shirley street.....	12	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from an open jet, the key of which was in poor condition.	1		Ordered that general repairs be made to fixtures.
Oct. 8.....	464 Huntington avenue..	7	Young lady, thirty-six years of age, took her own life.	1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Oct. 9.....	31 Causeway street.....	5	Lodger found dead from the effects of gas which escaped from a partly opened burner. Circumstances of case not known.	1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Oct. 10.....	76 Myrtle street.....	8	Tenant caused a fire at gas meter, she was hunting for a gas leak with a lighted candle.			No damage done to person or property.
Oct. 11.....	24 Upton street.....	6	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from an open key on gas bracket. It is unknown how key came to be opened.	1	Old.	Our inspector ordered that stop-pins be placed in keys and that keys be greased.
Oct. 16.....	12 Yarmouth street.....	7	Lodger took his life.....	1	Old.	Ordered that lights be protected by globe holders and that keys be greased and tightened.

Summary of Asphyxiations by Illuminating Gas, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.—Continued.

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Cause of Inspection.	PERSONS AFFECTED		New or Old Installation.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
Oct. 19.....	76 Green street.....	5	Lodger took his life.....	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Oct. 19.....	1 Hancock street.....	8	Lodger, found dead, first thought to be from effects of illuminating gas. Doctor's report indicates heart failure.				Not a gas case. Ordered that gas key be placed in a proper and safe condition.
Oct. 30.....	49 Lowell street.....	5	Tenant accidentally opened key of gas fixture and was overcome by the escaping gas.		1		
Oct. 31.....	4 Marcella street.....	15	Lodger, overcome by gas which escaped from a defective hose attached to a gas stove.	1		Old.	Ordered that independent fitting be removed.
Nov. 3.....	487 East Broadway.....	10	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from a defective hose connection attached to a gas radiator.		1	Old.	Defective hose connection has been remedied.
Nov. 7.....	658 Massachusetts avenue,	12	Young lady, twenty-five years of age, committed suicide.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Nov. 13.....	575 East Fourth street...	10	Tenant, while mentally unbalanced, attempted suicide. He was removed to the hospital for observation as to his mental condition.		1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Nov. 14.....	19 Greenwich park.....	7	Lodger was overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened cock which was accidentally turned on.		1	Old.	Ordered that independent fittings be removed.
Nov. 18.....	10 Groton street.....	6	Female lodger, sixty years of age, was found dead in bed, key of bracket was slightly opened.	1			Medical examiner's report gives cause of death as accidental gas poisoning.

Nov. 22.....	31 Causeway street.....	5	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from an open key on gas bracket. Circumstances of accident unknown.	1		New.	Ordered that all bracket ends be capped.
Nov. 23.....	767 Dorchester avenue...	11	Woman and niece overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened gas key which had been accidentally left open.		2	Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Dec. 2.....	238 Norwell street.....	19	Tenant, seventy-three years of age, accidentally left gas key open after extinguishing light.		1		
Dec. 2.....	47 Rutland street.....	6	Lodger attempted suicide.....		1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Dec. 5.....	2556 Washington street...	13	Male lodger, sixty-five years of age, committed suicide.	1		Old.	Ordered that independent fitting be removed and that keys be greased.
Dec. 8.....	2 Yeoman street.....	12	Tenant overcome by gas which escaped from an open key of a gas bracket which had been accidentally turned on when he hung his vest on bracket.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Dec. 10.....	44 Chandler street.....	6	Lodger committed suicide.....	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Dec. 10.....	75 Neptune road.....	1	Young lady overcome by lack of oxygen in her room. She was using a gas radiator and neglected to open window or door for the admission of fresh air.				Not a gas case.
Dec. 10.....	35 Wyman street.....	15	Tenant overcome by gas which escaped from an open burner of an independent fitting attached to a bracket, the cock of which had been accidentally left open.	1		Old.	Ordered that independent fittings be removed and that the outlets be capped.
Dec. 12.....	82 Endicott street.....	5	Tenant, while under the influence of liquor, accidentally reopened key after extinguishing light.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Dec. 12.....	46 East Brookline street..	6	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from an open burner of a gas fixture. Not known how accident occurred.		1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in good condition.
Dec. 15.....	531 East Eighth street...	10	Young man, twenty-two years of age, attempted suicide.		1	Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Dec. 15.....	446 Tremont street.....	6	Female tenant, sixty-two years of age, committed suicide.	1			

Summary of Asphyxiations by Illuminating Gas, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1921.—Concluded.

DATE. 1921.	Location.	Ward.	Cause of Inspection.	PERSONS AFFECTED.		New or Old Instal- lation.	Remarks.
				Fatally.	Nonfatally.		
Dec. 18.....	192 West Springfield st...	7	Lodger, while attempting to bore a hole in the stem of a gas burner was overcome by the escaping gas.	1			
Dec. 23.....	20½ Causeway street.....	5	Visitor from Philadelphia, Penn., attempted suicide.		1		Ordered that gas stove in kitchen be connected up with iron pipe.
Dec. 24.....	908 Harrison avenue.....	12	Housewife, sixty-eight years of age, accidentally disconnected hose from gas stove and was overcome by the gas which escaped.	1		Old.	Ordered that independent fitting be removed and gas stove be connected up with iron pipe.
Dec. 25.....	22 Causeway street.....	5	Tenant, while under the influence of liquor, accidentally opened key of fixture while extinguishing light.	1			
Dec. 25.....	22 Dwight street.....	6	Lodger, seventy years of age, was found overcome by gas which escaped from a hose cock attached to a radiator. The lodger failed to notice that key was missing from hose cock.		1	Old.	Ordered that independent fittings be removed and all keys be greased.
Dec. 25.....	1 Eaton street.....	5	Tenant, while under the influence of liquor, accidentally opened key of gas jet.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Dec. 26.....	748 Columbus avenue....	14	Visitor overcome by gas which escaped from a ten-inch extension used for hose connection, the cock of which was accidentally opened.	1			Our inspector tightened up cock of extension so that it cannot be used.
Dec. 26.....	402 East Fifth street.....	10	Tenant overcome by gas which escaped from the broken pipe of a three-light pendant which became accidentally broken.		1	Old.	Ordered that keys be greased and tightened and that stove in kitchen be connected up with iron pipe.

Dec. 26.....	22 Hanover avenue.....	5	Lodger, seventy-three years of age, despondent because of lack of work and funds, took his own life.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Dec. 26.....	627 Massachusetts avenue,	13	Lodger, while under the influence of liquor, overcome by gas which escaped from an unlit radiator.	1			Ordered that the use of radiator be discontinued and that all independent fittings in the building be removed, and that the service pipe be protected against condensation and frost.
Dec. 26.....	115 Paul Gore street.....	22	Tenant overcome by gas which escaped from a two-light fixture. Not known how cock came to be open.	1		Old.	Our inspector ordered that all gas fixtures in the house be overhauled.
Dec. 27.....	18 Anson street.....	22	Housewife overcome by gas which escaped from a burner of a wall bracket, the cock of which was accidentally opened.	1		Old.	Ordered that gas fixtures in building be overhauled.
Dec. 28.....	419 East Third street....	9	Tenant overcome by gas which escaped from a heater connected by a tube to a wall bracket. It is believed that in getting his clothes from a hook near bracket he accidentally opened gas cock.		1	Old.	Ordered that all gas keys be greased and holder be installed on bracket in bedroom.
Dec. 29.....	10 Greenwood park.....	20	Old man, eighty-one years of age, an inmate of Long Island Institution, committed suicide.	1			•
Dec. 29.....	267 K street.....	10	Young lady was overcome by gas which escaped from a burner of small gas stove. One of the jets was lit and it is probable that she accidentally opened the other jet.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Dec. 29.....	21 Milford street.....	6	Lodger overcome by gas which escaped from a partly opened burner which had been accidentally opened.	1		Old.	Fixtures found to be in fair condition.
Dec. 30.....	413 Massachusetts avenue,	7	Male lodger, sixty-five years of age, overcome by gas which escaped from a hose which became disconnected from a radiator.	1		Old.	Ordered that independent fitting be removed and that a defective bracket in cellar be replaced or removed.

SUMMARY OF GAS ASPHYXIATIONS AND ACCIDENTS AS REPORTED TO THIS DEPARTMENT, JANUARY 1, 1921, TO DECEMBER 31, 1921, INCLUSIVE.

Number of cases investigated	140
Number of persons affected *	143
Deaths due to gas poisoning	75
Nonfatal cases :	68
	<u>143</u>
Classification:	
Suicides and attempts at suicide	47
Independent fittings located behind gas brackets for hose connection, number of cases	16
Defective fixtures	11
Prepayment meter	3
Carelessness	46
Street leaks	4
Not gas cases	3
Details unknown	2
Fires due to illuminating gas	3
Miscellaneous	5
	<u>140</u>
Total	<u>140</u>

* Ten of the persons affected were under the influence of liquor.

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS RENDERED BY THE
BOARD OF APPEAL JANUARY 31, 1921, TO
DECEMBER 31, 1921.

CASE No. 2199.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

January 7, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits. It appeared that the building in question was occupied as a dwelling house for three families with a store in first floor of same. The appellant desired to resash front of store and provide a doorway to street from same. The building was located in a district rapidly changing to a business district. There was also but one means of egress from same. The Board was of the opinion that "if the interior walls and ceiling of store were protected with metal and the egress was improved" that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit, and with this proviso sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2200.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

January 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits. It appeared that the building was a composite building of second and third class construction and it was occupied as a dwelling house with store on first floor. The alteration consisted in extending a new bay window on second floor to the face of the wooden building. There was no increase in the ground area. In view of the minor character of the proposed alteration, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2201.

June 30, 1921.

Case void because of passage of new law governing sprinklers.

CASE No. 2202.

(Violation of Section 11, Paragraphs 1 and 33, Paragraphs 1 to 11, Inclusive, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

January 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of first-class construction and alteration proposed called for wooden construction. It appeared that the appellant was an oculist and it was necessary to install certain temporary partitions to form examination rooms which had to be darkened at times in connection with his business. The appellant occupied but one floor of the building, viz., the second floor. The Board was of the opinion that these temporary partitions should not be considered as an integral part of the building, but more as office fixtures, since they were for the benefit of the tenant. In view of the above the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2203.

June 30, 1921.

Case void because of passage of new law governing sprinklers.

CASE No. 2204.

(Violation of Sections 17, 42, 59, 61, 12, 52, 55, 56, 60, 63, 68, 69, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

January 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building because by said alteration building would be converted from a dwelling house into a tenement house. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was a dwelling house of second-class construction and the appellant desired to alter same by (a) removing present second floor and replacing with two new floors; (b) increasing present height of all to five floors; (c) changing inside partitions as shown on plans; (d) installing new elevator and

stairs; (e) building small addition in rear and extending chimneys, and thus changing the occupancy of the building and providing five apartments. The ground area of the building was not to be increased nor was any portion of the building increased in height above the limit of 60 feet. The building covered not more than 2,500 square feet and was well provided with egress. The apartments were large, there being but one on each floor.

While technically a tenement house, the Board was of the opinion that the character of the alteration was such that the spirit of the law was complied with and that it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the provisions of section 17, paragraph 1, and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to same. With reference to the provisions of sections 42, 59, 58, 60, 63 and 68 the Board is of the opinion that the appellant has complied with the spirit of the law and that the provisions for light and air are ample. Moreover, the Board had assurance from a representative of the Health Department that the plans as submitted to the Board were satisfactory. In view of all conditions, the Board sustains the appeal with reference to the above sections.

With reference to the provisions of sections 12, paragraph 15, 69, 52 and 61: The Board concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and dismissed the appeal with reference to same.

CASE No. 2205.

(Violation of Section 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

January 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building because by so doing the kitchen "would be reduced in its least dimensions to less than 8 feet." It appeared at the hearing, and upon examination of the plans, that the building in question was a dwelling house of third-class construction. The appellant desired to install closets in kitchens and would thus reduce the area of the kitchen in one portion to less than 8 feet although the remaining ground area of the kitchen was still in excess of the legal 64 square feet. The Board was of the opinion that the spirit of the law was complied with

and believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. It therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2206.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

January 19, 1921.

The appellant was granted a permit to make certain alterations of his building, but the Building Commissioner revoked the permit as it appeared that the appellant converted same into use as a store with living quarters above. It appeared that the appellant was in reduced circumstances and he, in ignorance of the law, lowered floor and replaced window in front room with door and intended to use same as a cobbler shop. In view of the minor character of the proposed alteration and the purpose for which room was to be used, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2207.

(Violation of Section 16, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

January 26, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed thickness of metal in construction members was less than $\frac{1}{4}$ inch. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was a one-story building with steel frame covered with galvanized iron resting on concrete foundation and with a dirt floor. The Building Commissioner refused a permit for this building, but the Board of Appeal sustained the owner's appeal from the commissioner's decision some time ago and the appellant considered this a permit and constructed his building. It developed that certain structural members of the frame were less than the legal thickness. At the hearing the appellant stated that he would be willing to reinforce all structural portions where necessary to meet requirements as to strength and stability as set forth in the building law. In view of this the Board felt that the requirements as to $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch structural members could be waived and with the proviso "that the appellant comply with the requirements of the law with reference to strength and stability" and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2208.

(Violation of Section 23, Paragraph 6, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907. as Amended.)

January 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as proposed bearing walls were less than the legal thickness required. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the walls in question refer to a pent house. The appellant desired to erect a pent house, with walls of brick 8 inches thick, over an existing well in the building with walls 12 inches in thickness. The 8-inch pent house walls carried no load except its roof and was to be used as an overhead space to reach upper part of elevator. The Board was of the opinion that the construction proposed was substantial and ample and believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2209.

(Violation of Sections 9, 13, 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

January 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits, roofing material was illegal, building was nearer than 10 feet to another building of same owner and there was a proposed increase in ground area. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of third-class construction, occupied by two families and a store. The appellant was located in the immediate vicinity for a number of years and was obliged to move as building in which he was established was sold over his head, so he desired to alter building in question by building small addition to same 7 feet by 15 feet by 7 feet. No portion of same came within 5 feet of the side lot line and 15 feet to neighbor's line on opposite side lot line. The appellant also desired to use rolled asphalt instead of asphalt shingles, which the Board considered the equivalent of same. While the proposed extension came nearer than 10 feet to another building on land of same owner, the distance between buildings in question was 9 feet 10 inches. The Board believed the spirit of the law was complied with and believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2210.

*(Violation of Sections 9 and 35, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.*

January 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits and also because the stability of the building would be impaired by proposed alterations. With reference to section 9: It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was occupied as a dwelling house and the appellant desired to change same into a printing office on the first floor with offices above. It was stated at the hearing that the building was originally for a storage warehouse and was later converted into a dwelling house. In view of this the Board believed that if "that portion of the building to be used for printing purposes was fire-stopped to the satisfaction of the Building Commissioner" the appellant should be allowed to make the proposed alteration and with the above proviso sustained the appeal with reference to section 9. With reference to section 35, the Board concurred with the Building Commissioner that the stability of the building would be impaired and dismissed the appeal with reference to the above mentioned section.

CASE No. 2211.

*(Violation of Sections 11, 23, 32 and 13, Chapter 550,
Acts of 1907, as Amended.*

January 26, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as same was an addition to a third-class building within the fire limits, the windows on lot line did not have the legal wire glass, metal frame and sash and the building was nearer than 5 feet to the lot line and lacked the legal masonry wall on that side towards the lot line. It appeared that the building was to be occupied as a carpenter's and coppersmith's shop and was built partly on a wharf. The ell portion was destroyed by fire, which was previously of third-class construction. The appellant constructed a new building covering the area of the former ell, but the new building was considerably larger than that destroyed. The new construction, however, was superior, being built on steel frame and

covered with wire lath and plaster, but it was on wharf property and could have been built of wooden frame. One wall of the building was within 5 feet of the lot line, but it was on the same line as original ell. There was a technical violation of the law in regard to that portion of the building which was not built on the wharf, but in view of the fact that the area of the ell was not more than 25 per cent of the area of the entire building, the appellant could have restored the ell in its original material with wooden frame. The Board was of the opinion that the new construction met the requirements of a second-class building and was superior to constructions usually erected on wharves and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2212.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.

February 3, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits. It appeared that the appellant desired to straighten out third story front and rear and erect outside rear wooden stairway from third story to yard with large landings forming small rear piazzas. No portion of the proposed alteration came within 5 feet of the lot lines, nor would building with new construction cover 60 per cent of the lot area. In view of this and the fact that a new egress was provided, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2213.

(Violation of Section 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 3, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed foundations were not in accordance with the provisions of above mentioned section. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was to be occupied as an office building to be built on filled land. The proposed foundations were to carry only the weight of walls and roof, the floor being built over a cinder fill on ground. An examination of the soil by a competent engineer, record of which were placed with the

Building Department, showed the fill to be almost compact as natural soil. In view of this, the Board believed that the appellant should be allowed to use the spread footings on the fill and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2214.

*(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

February 3, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same contemplated an extension in area to exceed the legal 3,500 square feet allowed for houses of habitation of second-class construction. It appeared that the building was occupied by one family and the appellant desired to increase the size of his dwelling house by connecting the house adjoining his property by means of openings in the existing party wall. The addition increased the area of the entire area to about 200 feet in excess of the legal requirements. The main building proper covered 2,500 square feet, the remaining area being in the ell which was only one story high. The ell was separated from the main building by means of a brick wall and the Board believed that "if the openings in this brick wall were protected by fire doors, thus making the main building a separate building from the ell," that the spirit of the law would be complied with. With the above proviso, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2215.

June 30, 1921.

Case void because of passage of new law governing sprinklers.

CASE No. 2216.

Similar to Case No. 2215.

CASE No. 2217.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2215.

CASE No. 2218.

*(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

January 26, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to exhibit moving pictures as building was not of first-class construction.

It appeared that the appellant desired to give exhibitions for five evenings only in connection with a convention he was holding. The Board believed that the exhibition of moving pictures on specific dates applied for would not constitute a conversion of the building in question into a moving picture house. And with the proviso "that exhibitions were given on specified dates only and that the moving picture booth was located to the satisfaction of the Building Commissioner, also that a fireman in uniform be stationed near the machine," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2219.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 3, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as said alteration contemplated an extension of area of a third-class building within the fire limits. It appeared that the appellant desired to build an addition to an existing third-class building occupied as a wagon shed. The addition was but 20 feet by 60 feet and one story high. The long side of the building was on a railroad right-of-way and rear of the addition was not to be nearer than 5 feet to the lot line. In view of its location, temporary nature, and purpose for which it was to be used, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2220.

February 3, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2221.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as alteration contemplated an extension of a third-class building within the fire limits and proposed roofing was not in accordance with the provisions of section 13, paragraph 21. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in

question is of second-class construction and the appellant desires to build an addition one story high 25 feet by 28 feet of third-class construction. The building is well isolated, the nearest distance to the lot line being 22 feet. The roof of the proposed new addition is of rolled asphalt in lieu of asphalt shingles as required by law. Owing to the temporary nature of the building, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the proviso that "building was removed two years from date of its erection," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2222.

(Violation of Section 38, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 18, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed construction of shaft was not in accordance with the above mentioned section. It appeared at the hearing that the Board of Health had ordered a ventilation to the outer air of interior bathrooms. The appellant provided same by converting chamber closets adjoining bathroom, closing present door openings and making new openings to bathrooms, said shaft extending from floor of suite 1 to and through roof with metal ventilator and skylight. The Board believed that "if the interior walls of the proposed shaft were wire lathed and plastered throughout and that all openings in same were protected by metal sashes with wire glass" that the appellant should be exempted from constructing shaft of iron and therefore sustained the appeal with this proviso.

CASE No. 2223.

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to provide fixed ladder to roof, reinforce partition wall with 4-inch by 6-inch brick pilasters and to ventilate water-closet in accordance with the provisions of sections 12 and 33, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. It appeared at the hearing that while the appellant omitted brick pilasters the strength and stability of the wall was not impaired as same was not a bearing wall but was used merely as a fire protection. The Board therefore sustained the appeal in this particular. It also appeared that the

partitions around the toilet room did not run to ceiling of the room in which they were located and therefore same had ventilation to the outer air as there was a large window in room. The Board believed that the ventilation was adequate and therefore sustained the appeal in this particular. With reference to ladder to roof, the Board concurred with the Building Commissioner in ordering same and therefore dismissed the appeal in this particular.

CASE No. 2224 TO CASE No. 2227.

February 18, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2222.

CASE No. 2228.

(Violations of Sections 9, 13 and 35, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused permit to alter building as proposed alteration contemplated an extension of area of a third-class building within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the appellant desired to improve his building by providing more egress, new open plumbing, electric lighting and fix up first floor for modern stores with new store fronts. A new boiler was to be installed in basement which was to be isolated from the remainder of the basement. The floor of the stores were to be lowered and the space beneath made inaccessible. The Board believed that if "all the interior walls and ceilings of stores were wire lathed and plastered throughout," that the proposed alteration would improve the building materially and with the above proviso sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2229.

(Violation of Sections 20, 23 and 32, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused permit to erect building, as thickness of external walls was illegal, proposed structural members were not fireproofed and foundation loads were not carried down to satisfactory bear-

ing material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a small temporary structure of steel to be used as an office for a gasolene station. The Board believed that if the piers, ten in all, were carried on a footing 2 feet square, that the bearing material would be satisfactory for a building of this type. With the above proviso, the Board sustained the appeal with reference to section 20. With reference to sections 23 and 32, in view of the temporary nature of the proposed structure, the Board believed that the appellant should be exempt from conforming strictly to the above provisions and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2230.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 3, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2231.

(Violation of Section 40, Paragraph 1, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 16, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as "part of building came within 10 feet of another building on land of same owner without an intervening brick wall." It appeared that the building was a double house of third-class construction and the proposed alteration consisted of the erection of an outside rear stairway which provided a second means of egress to second story of same. While the building was within 10 feet of another building on land of same owner, and the brick wall was omitted, the Board believed no advantage would be gained by requiring the appellant to build this wall but was of the opinion that a decided advantage over present conditions would be effected by the furnishing of this second means of egress. The Board believed that both houses would be benefited by this second means of egress and with the proviso "that a future door be provided from the second floor of each house," sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2232.

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to conform to the elevator and escalator regulations, section 4, Division B, 39a, which required that the speed of the elevator be 150 feet per minute and not 275 feet as the tachometer reading showed upon examination by the inspector. The Board having heard the appellant, concurred with the Building Commissioner and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2233.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as proposed amendment contemplated third-class construction in the fire limits. The Board having heard the appellant, concurred with the Building Commissioner in his decision and dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2234.

Similar to Case No. 2215.

CASE No. 2235.

(Violation of Sections 17, 77 to 104, Inclusive, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building into a moving picture house as same was not of first-class construction. The Board having heard the appellant, and having examined the plans, was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner was justified in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2236.

(Violation of Sections 9, 20 and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 16, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as same was of third-class construction, foundations

were not carried to satisfactory bearing material and roofing material was illegal. It appeared that the appellant desired to erect a third-class building 20 feet by 75 feet, one story high, with a rubberoid roof to protect his sashes from the weather. The building was to be built on leased land, which could terminate upon a thirty days' notice. The Board was of the opinion that since proposed building was of a temporary nature that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant and with the proviso "that same was removed one year from date of its erection," sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2237.

March 23, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to repair and install landing gates in accordance with the provisions of Division 9, section 1, Regulation 75, elevator and escalator regulations. It appeared that the elevator in question was used exclusively for carrying pleasure automobiles and was formerly protected by gates. These gates were continually breaking, so the appellant installed a closed metal covered door which locked inside by the elevator man. The Board believed that the protection against accident provided was the equivalent of that afforded by the landing gates, and was of the opinion that no advantage would be gained by the requiring of same. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2238.

February 18, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2239.

February 24, 1921.

Withdrawn.

CASE No. 2240.

(Violation of Section 34, Paragraph 9, Chapter 550, Acts 1907, as Amended.)

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed alteration consisted of changing a workshop of third-class construction into a dwelling house and same came within 5 feet of the lot line and proposed

structure would not be in accordance with the regulations required for a new building. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner was justified in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2241.

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to install sprinklers in basement story of his building. It appeared that the building in question was of a type which the Board believed did not come under the regulations of section 45, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, and chapter 440, Acts of 1920, and it therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2242.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 35, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same would be a change of occupancy from a two-family dwelling to a three-family dwelling house and the change would increase the fire risk of the structure as a whole. It appeared that the alteration consisted of merely the installation of a bathroom with skylight over it, and the providing of a doorway and a non-bearing partition. The proposed alteration gave two means of egress from the building. In view of the minor character of the alteration, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2243.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits and wooden wall was within 5 feet of lot line. It appeared that the building was occupied as a dwelling house and store and had a pitched roof. The appellant desired to straighten out attic rooms and arrange for new egress from same. The rooms were already occupied for living purposes and the alteration contemplated merely making them more livable. Owing to the character of same, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2244.

*(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of second-class construction and first floor of same was not of first-class construction as required for a store. It appeared that the appellant desired to occupy first floor of his dwelling house as a store. The store was to be reached from the exterior and was to be cut off entirely from the rest of basement by means of brick walls and ceiling of same was to be strictly fireproof. The Board believed that if "the single opening in rear of store to basement was protected by a metal covered door and frame and made self-closing" that the store would be made independent and fireproof. With the above proviso, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2245.

*(Violation of Sections 9 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

March 5, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same would exceed the legal 2,200 square feet in area without being covered with incombustible material and covers more than 60 per cent of the lot area. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of third-class construction, one story high, occupied for club and lodge rooms. The Board found that the building when enlarged covered but 5 per cent more than allowed legally and believed that there would be no increase in the fire hazard under the circumstances and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 9. With reference to section 40 it appeared that the addition abutted on a railroad right of way and was 5 feet from the side lot lines. The roof was covered with asphalt shingles. While the building with addition exceeded the legal 2,200 square feet by 1,400 square feet, the Board was of the opinion that owing to its location and height that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2246.

(Violation of Section 12, Paragraph 1, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

February 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2247.

(Violation of the Provisions of Sections 23 and 32, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 5, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to move present metal garage as walls were illegal and structural members were not fireproofed. It appeared that the appellant desired to move back an existing building 5 feet from his house and occupy same as workshop. The building was 18 feet by 20 feet. Owing to the incombustible nature of the building and purposes for which it was to be used, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2248.

Similar to Case No. 2215.

CASE No. 2249.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building within the fire limits. It appeared that the appellant desired to construct a bakery oven in rear of his building. The plans were so arranged that bakery was partially cut off from the remainder of the building by means of two self-closing doors, operating on both sides of an existing 8-inch brick wall. The floors, walls and ceilings immediately in front of inclosure thus formed was of fireproof construction so that the bakery proper was entirely of fireproof construction.

The Board believed that the spirit of the law was complied with and was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2250.

February 24, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2251.

March 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2246.

CASE No. 2252.

(Violation of Sections 11 and 33, paragraphs 1-11, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 5, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same contemplated the installation of wooden partitions in a first-class building. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner was justified in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2253.

(Violation of Section 53, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to install oven in building as same was a tenement house. It appeared that the appellant proposed to build practically an independent fireproof structure reaching same from yard at rear of his building; the yard to be entered from the street by means of a passageway running lengthwise with the building. The oven stood on an entirely separate foundation and the construction was such that complete isolation was provided. The Board believed that no danger would be incurred by allowing the appellant to construct same and was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board, therefore, sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2254.

*(Violation of Section 63b, Chapter 806, Acts of 1913,
as Amended.)*

March 15, 1921.

The Building Commsisioner refused to waive the above-mentioned regulations as he had no authority to do same. It appeared that the appellant desired to install an elevator in a first-class building, and to omit buttons at shaftway openings with a bell in shaftway or other signal system, as same was a freight elevator serving only one owner who by the exigencies of his demands would administer this elevator in an entirely different way. It also appeared that the building was equipped with an electric automatic device for the control of the car. The Board believed that this was a case not contemplated by the law though covered by it and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2255.

March 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as bolts were used in lieu of rivets. It appeared that the building was designed to comply with the law as to strength and stability, but there was a technical violation with regard to using bolts instead of rivets. It appeared that the building was built before the appellant was aware of a violation. In view of the circumstances, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to rebuild building of this type with rivets only and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2256.

March 15, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2243.

CASE No. 2257.

March 5, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to discontinue use of room as grocery store as same was in violation of the provisions of sections 36 and 17, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. It appeared that the appellant was using front room for sale of canned goods, milk, bread, to

provide a livelihood for herself and her sick husband. The Board was of the opinion that under the circumstances it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to remove same and with the proviso "that no inflammable material be sold or kept in store," sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2258.

(Violation of Section 8, Paragraph 4, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed calculation of construction of bottom of shaft was not in accordance with above-mentioned section. It appeared that the construction referred to the bottom of an elevator shaft beneath which there was an office. While the calculation for construction of this floor did not conform strictly to section 8, paragraph 4, the Board was of the opinion that the spirit of the law was complied with and no additional safety would be gained by requiring the appellant to increase the beams of the floor of the bottom of the pit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2259.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 5, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits and was within 10 feet of another building on land of same owner. It appeared buildings in question were two three-story dwelling houses on land of same owner, separated by a brick wall, and the appellant desired to build piazzas at rear of same. No portion of proposed piazzas came within 5 feet of the side lot lines, nor 28 feet from the rear lot line. The two buildings with piazzas did not cover 60 per cent of the lot. Owing to the nature of the proposed alteration, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2260.

(Violation of Section 35, Paragraph 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same contemplated change of occupancy from shop to dwelling. It appeared that the building in question is of wood, one and a half stories high with a pitched roof of asbestos shingles and a small ell one story high with a flat roof. The exterior of same will be covered with stucco. A certain portion of the building comes within 5 feet to side lot line. The Board was of the opinion that "if all openings in that portion nearer than 5 feet to the lot line were protected with metal frames and wire glass" that the spirit of the law would be complied with and that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the above proviso, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2261.

(Violation of Sections 23 and 32, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect addition to building on premises 34 Roland street, Ward 3, as external walls were not of the required thickness, columns were not fireproofed and some of the joints were bolted instead of riveted. It appeared that the building in question was an extension to a mill for cutting stone and was to be built of same construction as original building, which was of steel frame and exterior walls were of terra-cotta with tile roof. With reference to section 23, a considerable portion of the exterior wall at the gable end was of glass and while the construction allowed the appellant to glaze the gable, he desired to have this gable shown as solid, but did not want to construct wall of masonry and offered as a substitute the covering of asbestos corrugated siding, properly supported in place of masonry walls. The Board believed that since he could be allowed to glaze the gable, the method proposed was superior to the glazing. Furthermore, the Board was of the opinion that this was a

case not contemplated by the law though covered by it and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 23. With reference to section 16, it appeared that the appellant proposed to bolt the field connections in certain trusses instead of riveting same. The conditions were such that it was impossible to rivet same. The Board believed that the strength and stability of the building was not impaired by allowing the method proposed and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 16. With reference to section 32, the appellant desired to omit fireproofing certain interior columns. There was no wood used in the construction of this building and it was well isolated. The Board was of the opinion that the occupancy of the building was such that there would be no increase to the fire risk incurred by allowing the columns to stand without fireproofing, the building being unusually well constructed and superior to most sheds for the cutting and handling of stone. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2262.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect piazzas as same would be a third-class construction within the building limits and was less than 5 feet from the lot line. It appeared that the appellant desired to construct piazzas with staircase in rear of his building at each floor level, thus providing a second means of egress. No portion of same came within 5 feet of the side lot lines. While they came within 2 feet of the rear lot line, there was a permanent 6-foot right-of-way in rear. In view of this, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2263.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect wooden store building as same was a third-class building within the fire limits. The Board having heard the appellant

and having examined the plans was of the opinion that the refusal of the Commissioner was justifiable and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2264.

(Violation of Sections 12, 77 to 114, Inclusive, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner, and construction was not in accordance with the building law governing theaters. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was of second-class construction. The first floor was occupied by a store and nickelodeon, the floor above was also occupied for amusement purposes. The appellant desired to abandon the present occupation of the first and second floors and to construct a new auditorium for use as a moving picture house. Egress was to be provided from the picture house, which was on the first floor, by a large central entrance and side entrances leading to passageways on either side of the auditorium, one of which led directly to the street. The entire first floor was to be of fireproof construction. The plans showed ceiling and stud partition covered with wire lath and cement plaster, the partitions being filled with gypsum block. The Board believed that "if both of the 6-foot passageways were continued to the street and all new walls were constructed of gypsum block or terra cotta, also that all ceilings were protected with metal lath and plaster," that the existing conditions would be very much improved by the proposed alteration. Therefore with the above mentioned proviso, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2265.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building into a store and dwelling as same was within the fire limits. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2266.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 23, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of second-class construction and the first floor was not fireproofed. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was a one-family dwelling house and the appellant desired to use the first floor of same for a real estate office in connection with his business by changing the front facing on Saratoga street, and providing show window and entrance door. Owing to the nature of the proposed alteration and its occupancy, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2267.

June 30, 1921.

Case void because of passage of new law governing sprinklers.

CASE No. 2268.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as part of third-class building was less than 5 feet from lot line. It appeared upon examination of the plans that the present front piazza of the building was already about 3 feet from the lot line and the appellant desired in the interests of improving his property to carry present piazza to roof line so as to provide a porch from the second and third floors. The area of the building was not to be increased. Owing to the nature of the proposed alteration, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2269.

March 23, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2258.

CASE No. 2270.

(Violation of Section 9 Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

March 21, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits. It appeared that the structure in question was a spray pond, the louver fence of which was of wood. The Board understood that this type of louver was more efficient than one of steel and that the use of wood for the cooling system was of a more permanent construction. Moreover, these louvers were protected continuously by water which flowed over same, so that in the opinion of the Board the fire hazard was not increased by allowing the use of this material. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2271.

April 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2268.

CASE No. 2272.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 13, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building was of third-class construction occupied as a three-family dwelling house. The appellant desired to adapt first floor of same for store purposes and provide new piazzas and back stairs for the entire building. The store was small and the Board believed that if the entire store was isolated properly from the rest of the building no danger would be incurred by granting the appellant a permit. Therefore with the proviso that "all walls surrounding the store proper were brick-nogged and covered with wire lath and plaster and that the entire ceiling was covered with wire lath and plaster," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2273.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 35, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 2, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was a change of occupancy from a two-family dwelling house to a store and dwelling. It appeared upon examination of the plans that the appellant desired to build store in the basement of his house. The walls of the proposed store were of brick and the appellant proposed to separate the rest of the basement from store by erecting a brick partition. The ceiling was to be wire lathed and plastered. The opening to store was from the exterior only and there was no access to dwelling portion of building. In view of the fact that the appellant provided a practically independent fireproof inclosure for store, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2274.

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove window opening in rear wall as same was of wooden frame and sash and plain glass and came within 5 feet of the rear lot line, also to cover the outside finish of building with combustible material in accordance with the provisions of sections 13 and 12, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. It appeared that the building in question was a garage of second-class construction which was already erected. The rear of building was 4 feet from the lot line. The original plans contemplated windows on the side of the garage, but because of some objection by a neighbor, the contractor moved the window to the rear wall so that same became illegal, not being of fireproof construction. The wood rafters projected about 1 foot beyond the exterior wall line and while technically these rafters might be considered as outside finish, the Board believed no possible danger could arise by allowing rafters to project and that it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the provisions of the law with reference to second-class buildings and therefore sustained the appeal in this particular. The Board also felt that it

would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to remove the existing small window at the rear of his garage and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2275.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 23, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 2, 1921.

It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was of second-class construction, two and one half stories high occupied as a store and dwelling. The appellant desired to occupy same as store and tenements by removing pitched roof and carrying up walls of brick front and back; putting on new tar and gravel roof and building second means of egress by means of a piazza and stairs in rear. With reference to section, no portion of proposed piazzas nor rear outside staircase came within 5 feet of the side lot lines not 12 feet from the rear. The Board believed that the alteration would considerably improve existing conditions and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 9. With reference to section 23, while the 8-inch walls were less than the legal thickness, the Board believed that neither the strength nor stability would be impaired by allowing the proposed improvement of the upper story and therefore it would be a manifest injustice to require him to thicken same. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2276.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed construction was of third-class and came within 5 feet of the side lot line. It appeared that the appellant desired to make certain changes to an existing piazza, the principal reason being to provide a better entrance to his front door. This he proposed to do by inclosing the present piazza and opening door towards the street instead of towards an adjoining neighbor's house. The Board understood that the original piazza was already within 5 feet of the side lot line, and that no portion of inclosed veranda would

be nearer than the original. Owing to the nature of the proposed alteration the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2277.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as there was a store in basement of habitation and first floor and basement were not of first-class construction. It appeared upon examination of the plans that the building was of second-class construction occupied as a dwelling house and storage. The appellant desired to occupy and alter for same purposes. The alteration consisted of the installation of a front plate glass window. The entrance to store led directly to street, there being no entrance from the dwelling house portion of the building to the store. The alteration formed an independent fireproof inclosure. Owing to the construction proposed, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and with the proviso "that the staircase leading to upper floor be either removed entirely or protected with fireproof inclosure and self-closing doors," sustained and appeal.

CASE No. 2278.

March 31, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2279.

(Violation of Sections 12 and 39, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 2, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as wood supports were below the first floor and foundation was not of brick or stone. It appeared that the structure in question was of temporary nature to be used as a hencoop, 20 feet by 30 feet, and was but one story high and would not be subjected to any heavy loads. In view of all conditions the Board believed that the supports proposed were adequate and it would be a

manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the above mentioned provisions and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2280.

(Violation of Section 33, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 2, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as proposed partitions were of wood in a building of first-class construction. It appeared that the appellant desires to install certain partitions in an existing mezzanine story of his building which was of second-class construction. The building was built to a height of four stories, although it was designed ultimately to be carried seven stories. A building of the present height could have been built in second-class construction. In view of this, and the fact that the appellant would be compelled to remove the mezzanine floor and partitions when the building was carried to its ultimate height, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2281.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building for school purposes as same was of second-class construction. It appeared that the appellant wanted to use same building for vocational education in rehabilitating ex-service men by giving them shop experience which would enable them to earn a living wage. The building leased for purposes mentioned above was temporary the appellant leasing for one year only, owing to the uncertainty of the government contract. The Board believed that while technically the occupancy might be considered the equivalent of a school, the conditions as to egress, occupation, etc., were more favorable than in the average school and no danger would be incurred by allowing the proposed occupancy in this class of building under the circumstances. Therefore with the proviso

“that the appellant discontinue use of building as a school April 1, 1922,” the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2282.

(Violation of Section 12, Paragraph 11, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as proposed outside finish of second-class building was not of incombustible material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was an old church built in 1807, and the appellant desires to restore same as far as possible in the original form and material, such as pedestals, urns, rail and balusters at level of flat roof of tower and consoles for upper part of tower, thus using wooden construction. The Board was of the opinion that, owing to the type of building and nature of proposed alteration, it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the provisions of section 12 and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2283.

(Violation of Section 23, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed walls were not of the legal thickness, being 8 inches. It appeared that the building in question was of second-class construction with a pitched roof covered with slate. The main portion of the building was three stories high with attic, and the ell was three stories with a flat roof. The building was used as a tenement house for four families and had a front and back stairs and was to be used for the same purpose after alteration. The appellant desired to square rooms on upper story by changing pitched roof to a flat. The Board believed that proposed alterations were of a nature that would not impair the strength and stability of the building, the extreme height of the building being slightly reduced and existing conditions materially improved, and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2284.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits. It appeared that the appellant desired to erect rear piazzas at each floor level of a third-class building. Proposed piazzas were 6 feet by 15 feet and no portion of same came within 5 feet of the side lot lines and 50 feet from the rear lot line. In view of the minor character of the alteration, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2285.

April 31, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2286.

(Violation of Sections 17, 77 to 111, Inclusive, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building into a moving picture house as same did not conform to the theatre regulations and building would be converted into a theatre. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined sketch submitted was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner was justified in his refusal and therefore affirmed same.

CASE No. 2287.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 13, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building into a moving picture house as same was not of first-class construction. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore affirmed same.

CASE No. 2288.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as proposed alterations contemplated a change of occupancy from a dwelling house to a store and dwelling house, of a third-class building within the fire limits. It appeared that the appellant desired to alter first floor for store purposes by fire-protecting walls and ceilings of same as well as to install a store front. The cellar immediately under store was entirely separated by masonry walls from the remainder of the basement, and interior walls surrounding store proper were to be brick-nogged and all of walls and ceiling were to be wire lathed and plastered. In view of the character of the alteration the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2289.

(Violation of Sections 39 and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as foundation and underpinning were required, framing inadequate and roofing material illegal. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of a temporary nature, to be used as a summer house. It was what is known as a Hodgdon portable house and was to be placed in the rear of the appellant's property, well isolated from other buildings, the nearest being 200 feet away. Owing to the purpose for which it was to be used and its location, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the above-mentioned sections and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2290.

(Violation of Section 53, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as he proposed to install a bakery in a tenement house.

It appeared that the building in question was of second-class construction and the appellant desired to install a small gas oven in the rear of his store on the first floor. The room in which the oven was located was to be cut off from the remainder of the building by terra-cotta fireproof partitions, and all openings in same were to be protected by metal covered doors and the floor was to be of concrete cut in between 4-inch by 10-inch timbers now existing. The ceiling was of metal. The Board was of the opinion that the law was obviously intended to cover the old type of baking oven, in which coal was used and fire drawn at intervals, and saw no danger in allowing use of this type of gas oven in room protected as appellant proposed, and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2291.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 36, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 13, 1921.

The appellant was refused permit to alter building as same was a dwelling house of third-class construction and was to be converted for use as a mercantile establishment and dwelling house. It appeared that the building in question was situated on a corner of two streets and separated from the next building by an 8-inch brick party wall. The appellant desired to use front room of first floor as a tailor shop and proposed to provide a small show window and an entrance directly to the street, also to cover the ceiling and walls with metal. The Board believed that "if all the wooden walls were wire lathed and plastered; the brick party wall plastered directly on the brick; ceiling wire lathed and plastered; also that all interior doors leading from store were covered with metal," that the proposed occupancy would not constitute a fire hazard. With this proviso the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2292.

April 9, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2291.

CASE No. 2293.

*Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

April 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of second-class construction and he desired to use basement for mercantile purposes and first floor was not of first-class construction. It appeared that the building was used as a dwelling house for three families, with janitor's apartment in basement. The appellant desired to change this basement apartment to a dining room, providing an outside entrance to same to street. The Board believed that if all the interior partitions of the basement thus converted were made of fireproof material and ceiling of same was wire lathed and plastered, that the spirit of the law would be complied with. With the above proviso, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No 2294.

*(Violation of Sections 9 and 36, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

April 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused permit to alter building as same would be a change of occupancy from dwelling to office use in third-class building in fire limits and floor loads would be increased. It appeared that the building in question had a shingled roof, was two stories high and was last used as a single family dwelling house. It was provided with two means of egress. The appellant desired to make no changes but to use same as an office building for a city department. With reference to section 36, it believed that the change of occupancy for the purposes proposed would not justify any further strengthening of the timbers, owing to the increased floor load, and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 36. With reference to section 9, the Board did not consider contemplated change hazardous, more especially as a watchman was to be on duty at all hours, and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2295.

*(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

April 13, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter second-class building for use for mercantile purposes, as first floor was not of first-class construction. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a tenement house, four stories high. The appellant desired to lower first floor to street level, resash the front for a store with plate glass. The Board believed "that if all studded walls now surrounding a portion of the proposed store were brick-nogged and covered with wire lath and plaster, and if that portion of the first floor which was to be used as a store was made of first-class construction and all openings in same walls were protected with metal-covered fireproof doors; also that ceiling was covered with wire lath and plaster that the spirit of the law would be complied with. Therefore with this proviso, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2296.

*(Violation of Section 33, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

April 13, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter first-class building as partitions proposed were of third-class construction. It appeared that the appellant desired to build certain temporary movable partitions in one floor of his building to give additional offices for tenant. Not more than 20 per cent of the floor was so divided. The Board was of the opinion that proposed partitions, owing to their construction and arrangement, did not form a structural part of the building and believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board, therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2297.

*(Violation of Section 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

April 13, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed foundations were not in accordance with

above-mentioned section. It appeared that the building in question was a one-car garage. The Board was of the opinion that the fill, which had been in place for a long time, was capable of carrying without any danger the load which the appellant proposed to impose on it. The footings were spread to transmit a load to the soil of less than 400 pounds per square foot, and the foundation carried only the walls and roof, the floor being directly on the ground. The Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to drive piles and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2298.

*(Violation of Section 13, Paragraph 22, Chapter 550,
Acts of 1907, as Amended.)*

April 13, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect piazza as same "was of second-class construction and was less than 5 feet from the lot line without a wall." It appeared that the appellant had a daughter who was in poor health and she desired to erect a sleeping porch in order that the daughter might sleep out of doors. The piazza was not strictly of second-class construction although the frame was of metal. The Board believed that the construction was such that no danger would be incurred by allowing the appellant to come nearer than 5 feet to lot line, and, owing to the circumstances in this special case, believes that the appellant should be exempted from conforming strictly to the provisions of section 13, paragraph 22, and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2299.

*(Violation of Section 13, Paragraph 21, Chapter 550,
Acts of 1907, as Amended.)*

April 27, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as roofing material was not in accordance with the provisions of the above-mentioned sections. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired, in making repairs to his third-class building, to reshingle the roof with asphalt roll roofing material. While this was a violation of the law which required asphalt shingles, the Board believed that the material proposed was the equivalent, being made of the same material, and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2300.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case 2215.

CASE No. 2301.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case 2215.

CASE No. 2302.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2215.

CASE No. 2303.

April 13, 1921.

Withdrawn.

CASE No. 2304.

(*Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.*)

April 27, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as he proposed to change a two-family dwelling of third-class construction in the fire limits to a three-family dwelling house. It appeared that the building in question was two stories high with a pitched roof. The appellant desired to square up present roof and rearrange present rear stairs. The highest point of the roof will be reduced by the introduction of the flat roof in place of the pitched roof and the Board is of the opinion that the alteration will not involve any increase of the third-class construction, the roof being covered with a tar and gravel roof. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2305.

(*Violation of Section 23, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.*)

April 27, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed thickness of walls are illegal. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question is a dwelling house of second-class construction. The thickness of party wall at the first story was 12 inches and the remaining second and third stories 8 inches. The

appellant desired to change the present pitched roof to a flat roof, the rafters for the new flat roof resting on the present existing 8-inch party walls. The Board was of the opinion that the proposed alteration would not affect the stability of the building and no risk would be incurred by allowing the appellant to carry up wall to height desired, and believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2306.

(Violation of Section 13, Paragraph 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

April 27, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to install an Arcola heater as the above mentioned section reads, "No furnace or boiler for heating shall be placed upon a wooden floor." It appeared at the hearing that the heater in question consisted of a water-jacketed heater to be placed on zinc over asbestos on a wooden floor in the same manner as is customary with ranges in dwelling houses. This heater was for the purpose of providing hot water radiation in various parts of the building. The fire was entirely surrounded by a water jacket, through which water circulated to small radiators. The Board believed that the protection for this heater was greater against the possibility of fire than that of a parlor stove or kitchen range, and further believed that there was less fire hazard to the use of such a heater since one floor only was used to take the place of several floors if independent stoves were used. The Board believed that this was a case not contemplated by the law though covered by it and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2307.

(Violation of Section 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

July 26, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove violation of above-mentioned section, to wit, "metal covering required on wooden cornice overhanging side wall omitted." It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of second-class construction with the exception of the cornice, which was formed by the overhang of the roof rafters. These, together with the

facia boards nailed across the end of the rafters, were exposed. The brick work ran up between the rafters to the underside of the planks which covered the roof. The building was well isolated. The projection of the cornice was very slight. The Board believed that no advantage would be gained to this particular type of building by requiring the ends of this projecting rafter to be covered with metal. While there was a technical violation, the Board was of the opinion that the fire hazard was not increased by allowing the omission of this metal covering and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2308.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2215.

CASE No. 2309.

*(Violation of Section 14, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

May 20, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect bleachers as proposed form of construction were not satisfactory to the Building Department. It appeared at the hearing that the seats proposed to be used by the appellant were of the identical type which have been in use by circuses throughout the world for the past twenty-five years. No accident was known to have happened by reason of such construction. In view of the fact that the Board believed the construction safe, it was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2310.

*(Violation of Sections 13, 23, 32 and 20, Chapter
550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)*

May 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect steel building as same was in violation of the above-mentioned sections. It appeared that the building in question was a one-story steel structure, 16 feet by 28 feet by 19 feet, and the appellant desired to use same temporarily for the storage of metal and an office. The

building was well isolated, being 100 feet distant from the nearest building. The Board believed it would be a hardship to require the appellant to erect this temporary building of first or second-class construction and with the proviso "that building was removed one year from date of its erection" sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2311.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to install a store in house of habitation as first floor of second-class building was not of first-class construction. It appeared that the front window had been enlarged and changed to a doorway in order to allow egress to the front portion of the basement, the carpenter having made the change without advising the owner of the necessity of a permit, so that there was thus made a small room 12 feet square which had direct egress to the street. The appellant was using this portion of the basement for a small shop for the sale of light groceries. Owing to the size of same and purpose for which it was used, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2312.

April 29, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2309.

CASE No. 2313.

May 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits. It appeared that the building in question was occupied as a two-family dwelling house and the appellant desired to occupy same as a barber shop and the remainder of the building for a one-family house. The walls and ceilings were wire lathed and plastered throughout the entire store and the floor was to be covered with cement. The Board believed that the method shown on plans cut off the store in an effective manner from the dwelling portion of the building and therefore it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2314.

April 29, 1921.

Withdrawn.

CASE No. 2315.

May 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2316.

May 10, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to provide governors and to have safeties of elevator tested with load in presence of inspector in accordance with the elevator and escalator regulations of the Acts of 1913. The Board having heard the appellant concurred with the Building Commissioner in his order and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2317.

(Violation of Section 13, Paragraph 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as masonry rested upon wood. It appeared at the hearing that the masonry resting on wood was at best a technical violation only, since the refusal was based upon the use of wood joists for the carrying of a small concrete foundation for terrazzo tile or granolithic floor in the manner customary in second-class building. The board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2318.

(Violation of Sections 11 and 31, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as opening in party wall exceeded maximum allowed (50 per cent) in aggregate of length of wall. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of first-class construction, but it was connected to a second-class building by openings in an existing brick wall. The openings between the first and second class buildings, however, were protected by a double set

of self-closing fire doors so that the alterations to the second-class building were of such a nature that there was an absolute separation between the first and second class buildings. As the openings in the party wall occurred in the first-class portion of the building, the Board believed that there was no violation since the area of a first-class building of this nature could be unlimited in size, and was of the opinion that the provisions of section 31 did not apply. The Board, therefore, sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2319.

May 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2309.

CASE No. 2320.

May 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2299.

CASE No. 2321.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2215.

CASE No. 2322.

May 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2313.

CASE No. 2323.

May 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2296.

CASE No. 2324.

May 10, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question is a dwelling house of second-class construction. The appellant desired to connect same with another dwelling house of second-class construction by means of openings in party wall on certain stories. There were several interior staircases well placed and in addition there was good egress from the upper story to

the roof of the adjoining building. The Board was of the opinion that egress provided for a dwelling house of this type was ample and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2325.

May 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2326.

May 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2327.

May 10, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2328.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 10, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a two-family dwelling house with a pitched roof. Same was small, not being more than 20 feet wide and 60 feet deep. The appellant desired to alter same by squaring pitched roof and altering first floor into a store. The building was in a location which was rapidly changing into stores. Proposed walls and ceiling of store were to be wire lathed and plastered. Owing to the location and size of the building, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2329.

(Violation of Sections 35 and 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 10, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter second-class building as windows in living room did not open to outer air and egress was not satisfactory. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was to be occupied as a dwelling house. The appellant desired

to make a large hall with a large staircase at the rear of the building; this hall ran up two stories in height and covered practically the entire area of the lot. The nature of the proposed alteration was such, that in the opinion of the Board, ample ventilation was given to window in living room, which opened directly into this staircase hall and court, which in turn was ventilated by means of a skylight. The Board believed that the alteration was of such a type that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit for improvements contemplated and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2330.

(Violation of Section 35, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 10, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to change occupancy of building from habitation to a school as same was not of first-class construction. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of second-class construction and the appellant desired to use same as a private school for girls. No alterations were to be made in the plans. The school was very exclusive, there not being twenty-five or thirty pupils in all and for which there was to be five or six instructors. While technically the building might be considered a schoolhouse, the Board believed that the section referring to first-class construction for schools was not intended to apply to this particular case, it being a case not contemplated by the law though covered by it. The Board, therefore, sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2331.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 10, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed alteration contemplated an addition of third-class construction within the fire limits. It appeared that the building in question was of second-class construction with an existing sun parlor used as a convalescent home. The appellant desired to extend a roof over the balance of existing piazza and inclose with sash. The Board believed, owing to the nature of the

alteration and the fact that the existing piazzas were already of wood, that no advantage would be gained by requiring the appellant to construct the addition in second-class construction and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2332.

May 10, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2299.

CASE No. 2333.

(Violation of Section 10, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 20, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same would be within 10 feet to another wooden dwelling on land of same owner. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of third-class construction, and that, owing to the location of the door, the appellant desired to extend his piazza at a point far enough to allow of reaching the piazza from the door. This condition also applied to the adjoining house, so the front portions of the piazzas were 10 feet away, but the portion immediately against the wall in which each door opening occurred was slightly less than this. While there was a technical violation, the Board believed that it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the provisions of section 10 and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2334.

(Violation of Sections 9, 51, 64 and 49, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 20, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits, exceeded the legal area, minimum size of room was but 85 square feet and cellar ceiling was not metal lathed and plastered. It appeared at the hearing that the first floor was occupied as a society club room; the floors above, for dwellings and school purposes. The appellant desired to give up use of building as a school and alter same into an apartment corresponding with the other apartments. The Board believed that if the ceiling of basement was wire lathed and plastered that

the conditions as to safety were greatly improved and that there would be no additional hazard in allowing the change of occupancy. With the above proviso, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2335.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 20, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building of third-class construction as same was within the fire limits. It appeared that the appellant desired to add a piazza on front of his house at the first and second story levels. No portion of same came within 5 feet of the side lot lines. In view of the minor character of the proposed alteration, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2336.

May 20, 1921.

Withdrawn.

CASE No. 2337.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 27, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to increase area of building of third-class construction in the fire limits as same was not a one or two family dwelling house. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to remove two partitions forming the side of an existing passageway so as to make a larger show room and office. The ground area was not to be increased and the fire risk would be greatly lessened by proposed alteration. The Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit to make proposed change and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2338.

May 27, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2242.

CASE No. 2339.

May 20, 1921.

Withdrawn.

CASES No. 2340 to No. 2345.

June 30, 1921.

Void because of passage of new law governing sprinklers.

CASE No. 2346.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 27, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same contemplated the construction of third-class material which would be less than 5 feet to the adjoining lot line. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of third-class construction, occupied as a dwelling house. There was a bay window one story high at the first floor level of the house 6 inches away from the lot line, and the appellant desired to extend same to the second floor level. Owing to the minor character of the proposed alteration, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore acting under its discretionary power sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2347.

May 10, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2348.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 27, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to maintain locker and also to use mud sills in place of foundation, according to above-mentioned section. It appeared at the hearing that the structure in question was a temporary locker erected in connection with the erection of a first-class building. The building was completed but the appellant desired to maintain the locker, using same for a tool house. Same was small, being approximately 16 feet by 17 feet, and the owner intended in about a year to enlarge the present first-class building with an additional first-class structure. With the proviso "that same be removed one year from date, viz., May 27, 1922," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2349.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 2, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building, as side porch came within 5 feet of side lot line. It appeared that the appellant desired to construct an open piazza 6 feet by 5 feet on top of a present piazza. While same came within 5 feet of the side lot line, the adjoining property belonged to the same owner. The Board was of the opinion that the piazza was an open appurtenance and should not be considered as an integral part of the building. In view of this the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2350.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

May 27, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect temporary viewing stand as same was a third-class building within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the structure in question was to be used for one day only. The Board was of the opinion that since proposed structure was of a temporary nature, that it could not be termed "building" within the meaning of section 9, and therefore believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the proviso "that structure in question be constructed to the satisfaction of the Building Commissioner as to strength and stability," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2351.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 2, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans to alter building as same would be increasing area of wooden building within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant had been granted a permit previously by decision of the Board of Appeal to alter building and he now desired to carry store to

street line thus increasing the ground area 4 feet. In view of the minor character of the proposed alteration, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2352.

June 2, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2353.

(Violation of Section 120, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 7, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to install proposed system of plumbing as water-closets were supplied directly from the street main instead of from a tank or cistern. In order to sustain the appeal the Board would have had to vary the above-mentioned section, which could only have been done by the unanimous vote of the Board. Owing to the inability of the Board to unanimously agree on varying the law in this particular instance, it was compelled to dismiss the appeal.

CASE No. 2354.

June 2, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as materials and method of construction was not covered by the provisions of section 8. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a large church, the exterior walls of which were of Roxbury stone in cut ashlar work with cut granite trimmings. The church has been standing fifty years. The appellant desired to build a small addition to same in the form of a chapel, using the same materials. While this particular stone was not specifically mentioned in the building law, the Board believed that walls constructed of this material in manner shown was the equivalent of masonry walls of other materials allowed by the law and was of the opinion that same conformed to the spirit of the law as to strength. In view of the above the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2355.

(Violation of Section 14, Paragraph 41, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 2, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed brick bearing walls had greater height unsupported than twelve times their least dimension and were not properly braced by cross walls, piers or other means and were therefore in violation of the above-mentioned section. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his decision and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2356.

Pending.

CASE No. 2357.

July 26, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to provide new landing doors which slid in a horizontal direction in accordance with the elevator and escalator regulations. It appeared that the elevator in question had been in use twenty-three years and there had never been an accident on same. The landing doors in question were of the old-fashioned type and swung upon and were locked on the inside. They were so arranged that they could not be opened from the outside except at the first floor and then only by a key. In view of the existing conditions the Board believed it a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the above-mentioned regulations and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2358.

June 7, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to use asphalt shingles on a second-class building, as same would be in violation of the provisions of section 13, paragraph 21, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question had a wooden roof. The appellant desired to remove a wooden cupola and to use asphalt shingles to cover roof where cupola was instead of slate as required by law. In view of the fact that the remaining portion of the roof was of

wooden shingles, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2359.

June 7, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove violation of section 32 of the Boston building law to wit, electric wire conduits imbedded in the fireproofing required on columns supporting floors and roof. It appeared that the building in question was of first-class construction, to be occupied by the New England Telephone and Telegraph Company, and it was their intention to install between columns certain automatic switchboard apparatus to fit in between same. These columns were fireproofed in the legal manner but on certain of the columns $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch wire conduits were to be carried up from the floor in the fireproofing to the height of a switch approximately 3 feet 6 inches from the floor. In many cases these conduits came in the hollow portion of the columns so they did not come within the fireproofing area. In other cases, however, the conduits follow the flange portion of the column and come within $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch of the steel. If these conduits could not be placed in the fireproofing, it would be necessary to furr around the columns in order to conceal the conduits and bring the switch plates flush with the plaster. This furring of the columns would decrease the distance between columns and would prevent the installation of the intricate apparatus which the appellant had planned to install. The Board believed that it would be a great hardship to require the appellant to increase the size of columns in order to conceal these $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch conduits and boxes, as the imbedding of the conduits in these places did not affect the efficiency of the fireproofing. Moreover, the Board had on file a letter from a prominent engineer in which he expressed the opinion that "the only possible damage from pipes within fireproofing would be when the pipes were continuous from floor to floor and of sufficient stiffness so that the linear expansion would bend to buckle them and force out the fireproofing. Moreover, it could never occur where pipes or conduits extended only from the floor up to a switch box and not to the floor above." In view of all conditions, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2360.

June 30, 1921.

Void because of passage of new law governing sprinklers.

CASE No. 2361.

Similar to Case No. 2360.

CASE No. 2362.

Pending.

CASE No. 2363.

The appellant was ordered to conform to the elevator and escalator regulations to wit, section 9, regulation 112*d*, no light in machine room; regulation 65*a*, thoroughfare under car, ground floor, repair shipping cable; regulation 63 test safety. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant has installed a new shipping cable. With reference to thoroughfare under car, the Board found that the operation of the car was protected from the public by means of gates and therefore sustained the appeal in this particular. With reference to light in machine room and testing of safety, the Board concurred with the Building Commissioner in his order and therefore dismissed the appeal with reference to the above-quoted violations.

CASE No. 2364.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2360.

CASE No. 2365.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2360.

CASE No. 2366.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2307.

CASE No. 2367.

June 7, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2229.

CASE No. 2368.

June 7, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2350.

CASE No. 2369.

*(Violation of Section 13, Paragraph 21, Chapter 550,
Acts of 1907, as Amended.)*

June 9, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to recover roofs as proposed material was not in accordance with the above-mentioned provisions for a building of third-class construction within the fire limits as existed prior to 1913. It appeared at the hearing that the buildings in question were small dwelling houses with wooden shingle roofs. The rent from these was such that the owner would not be warranted in replacing the shingles with slate roofs and in addition to excessive cost of slate, these roof framings would need strengthening. The owner wished to use a lighter material in the shape of asphalt shingles. The Board believed that the shingles as at present existing were more of a hazard than the proposed asphalt. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2370.

June 9, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2350.

CASE No. 2371.

July 26, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to conform to the elevator and escalator regulations authorized by General Laws chapter 143, section 69, to wit, change gates so they will drop by gravity and not be mechanical action of car; install light in car. It appeared at the hearing that while the gates did not drop by gravity, the mechanical device by which the gates were closed was sufficient and under the circumstances it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the above-mentioned section. With reference to light, the Board found that car was lighted by windows from the outside of its entire length and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2372.

June 16, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2373.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

June 16, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building into a store and dwelling. In a previous decision the Board granted the appellant the favor of remodeling old building, but at the time did not favor the installation of a store on the first story. The Board was of the same opinion at the time of this appeal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2374.

*(Violation of Section 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

July 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner. It appeared that the building in question was of first-class construction, eight stories in height. The appellant desired to provide, as a second means of egress, the usual type of fire escape reached through windows from the various floors. The main staircase was well placed and of good proportion. The Board was of the opinion that "if all runs and balconies were protected with heavy wire grille 5 feet high and that fireproof, self-closing doors and frames are provided to same from each floor, said doors, if glazed, to be of wire glass," that the building would be provided with sufficient means of egress for an office building of this size and character. With the above-mentioned proviso the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2375.

*(Violation of Section 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

June 22, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed egress was not satisfactory to the Building

Commissioner. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of first-class construction, used as an office building and stores. In making certain alterations to store, the appellant had arranged fixtures in such a way that small entrance in the rear was to be discontinued. The Board believed that owing to the nature of the occupancy no danger would be incurred by permitting the closing of this second means of egress, the store being small and the entrance ample for the few people that would occupy the store at one time, and, under the circumstances, was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2376.

June 16, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2350.

CASE No. 2377.

June 16, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2369.

CASE No. 2378.

*(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

June 22, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of his building as same was to eliminate the fire wall separating the old structure from the new addition. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of third-class construction, to be used for the manufacturing of jewelry. In making certain necessary additions to same the appellant exceeded by 200 feet the legal area of 2,200 square feet. It was planned previously to overcome excessive area by the introduction of a brick party wall but which the appellant desired to omit. In view of all conditions, the Board believed the increase in the legal area was so slight that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant to amend his plans and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2379.

June 22, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2351.

CASE No. 2380.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 22, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as same was considered a third-class building within the fire limits and foundation loads were not carried down to satisfactory bearing material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a small metal-covered refreshment booth, approximately 8 feet by 15 feet, and was of a temporary nature. Same was in a well isolated place. In view of its temporary nature, size and construction, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the proviso, therefore, "that same be removed two and one-half years from date," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2381.

June 28, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove violation of section 12 to wit, roof of ell had not been framed according to approved plans. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant had used 2 by 6 rafters instead of the legal 2 by 8. The alteration was small and the owner was not aware that he had violated the law. In view of the fact that rafters were not over 16 inches apart, the Board believed there was no question as to the stability of the roof as built and was of the opinion that, under the circumstances it would be a manifest injustice to require him to remove same. The Board, therefore, sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2382.

(Violation of Section 63, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 16, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as aggregate area of window of kitchen was less than 11 square feet and tops of windows were less than 7 feet 6 inches above the floor. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of second-class construction. The appellant desired to use base-

ment for a suite. It further appeared that the building was practically built and to change these windows would destroy the architectural effect. While the windows shown did not conform strictly to the aforesaid provisions, the Board believed that they were sufficiently large to provide adequate light and air considering the room in which they were situated and that the spirit of the law was complied with. The Board, therefore, believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2283.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits. It appeared that the building was occupied as a dwelling house and the appellant desired to build a store in the basement of same. The front and side walls of the store were to be of brick and the appellant proposed to separate the remainder of basement from same by terra-cotta block partitions between brick piers. There was no access from the store to the dwelling portion of the building. The Board believed that "if the ceiling was protected with wire lath and plaster" that the appellant had provided an independent fireproof inclosure and that, under the circumstances, it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the above proviso the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2384.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2369.

CASE No. 2385.

June 30, 1921.

Same as Case No. 2369.

CASE No. 2386.

June 28, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2296.

CASE No. 2387.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect piazzas as same came within 10 feet of another building on land of same owner. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a four-family dwelling house divided in the center by a brick party wall. The appellant desired to erect in the rear of house on second floor level a piazza, 5 feet by 30 feet, with door from suite to same, as appellant's wife was ordered by doctor to sleep out of doors. Owing to the nature of the proposed balcony, the Board believed no advantage would be gained by requiring the appellant to carry the existing party wall out to the face of balcony. In view of all conditions, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2388.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed piazza came within 5 feet of lot line. It appeared that the appellant desired to remove steps of an existing piazza and in place to extend piazza 8 feet on one side towards the lot line, 3 feet on the front and 4 feet on the remaining side. The proposed extension was very small and as the proposed piazza was already nearer than 5 feet to the lot line, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2389.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2374.

CASE No. 2390.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

June 30, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building of third-class construction as same came within the fire

limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a three-family house with a mansard. The side walls were of brick. The appellant desired to straighten the mansard roof so as to give square rooms on the third floor and to provide all floors with piazzas and outside staircases, thus giving a second means of egress. No portion of proposed piazzas came within 5 feet of the side lot lines, not 12 feet from the rear lot line. In view of all conditions, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2391.

July 14, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove violations of section 36, paragraph 5, section 12, paragraphs 7 to 15, and 9, existing on his premises to wit, building now occupied by three families, kitchenette, 4 feet 3 inches by 6 feet 4 inches on second floor and egress not sufficient. It appeared at the hearing that the building was always occupied by three families. The building was built before 1907, so the original kitchenette on the second floor was always somewhat smaller in size than at present required. In making certain alterations, the suite in which kitchenette was installed, the appellant installed a bath room in its stead and provided a new kitchenette in a space occupied by a large closet. The new kitchenette was also less than the legal size but it was well lighted by a large window. As the suite was small, containing but two rooms and a bath, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to require the appellant to rebuild the kitchenette and therefore sustained the appeal in this particular. With reference to egress, the Board concurred with the Building Commissioner in his order and dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2392.

June 30, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove concrete block in wall of his garage and that no further blocks of the sort be used in any of the walls of the proposed structure where the work was only one-third done as same were in violation of the provisions of section 14, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. It appeared at the hearing that the wall in question was a nonbearing hollow block

wall, being a curtain wall built in between independent structural supports which carried all the loads, the wall in question carrying only its own load. The Board was of the opinion that although the blocks did not meet the test requirements under the above-mentioned section, that owing to the fact that the wall was partially completed, it would seem more reasonable to require the appellant to reinforce the walls in question instead of requiring him to remove blocks now in place. With the proviso therefore "that walls were reinforced by means of concrete fill and reinforcing rods in the voids forming piers to the satisfaction of the Building Commissioner," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2393.

June 30, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2392.

CASE No. 2394.

June 30, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to conform to the provisions of section 12 of the Boston building laws which he had violated in altering his building. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a theater of second-class construction. Certain walls were covered with sheet metal over which the appellant applied beaver board, covering same with fireproof cloth to cover the joints in the beaver board. In certain portions of the ceiling the metal was removed and the beaver board was tacked directly to the wood framing. The Board was of the opinion that no advantage would be gained by requiring the appellant to replace the metal behind the beaver board, the metal in question being of no greater protection than the fireproof cloth over the beaver board, and that it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the provisions of section 12. The Board, therefore, sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2395.

(Violation of Section 13, Paragraph 21, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907.)

July 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter his building as proposed roofing material was illegal. It appeared

at the hearing that the building in question was a garage and that the appellant desired to enlarge same, adding 6 feet to same, thus giving room for an additional car. The present roof was of wooden shingles and the appellant desired, in making the extension, to be allowed to use wooden shingles in order to harmonize the existing shingles which covered the roof. In view of all conditions, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to require the appellant to remove present roof and substitute with asphalt shingles and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2396.

(Violation of Section 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.

July 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed roofing material was not legal. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of third-class construction within the old fire limits. The appellant desired to recover roof with asphalt shingles, such as are allowed outside the building limits, to replace present wooden shingles. The Board believed that the shingles at present existing were more of a hazard than the proposed asphalt shingles and therefore believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2397.

August 1, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2392.

CASE No. 2398.

(Violation of Section 32, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.

July 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of his building as proposed roof trustees were not fire-proofed. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans, concurred with the Building Commissioner in his decision and dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2399.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

July 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed alteration contemplated an extension in area of a third-class building within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was two stories in height and the appellant desired to add another story. The entire floor area did not cover more than 900 square feet. The proposed new story was to be protected on two sides by existing brick walls and the two remaining walls were to be built of studding and covered with asbestos shingles. The roof was to be of composition. Owing to the size of the alteration and the fact that the studding was to be covered with asbestos shingles, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2400.

(Violation of Section 12, Paragraph 15, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907.)

July 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as proposed supports below the first floor were of wood in lieu of masonry or metal. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the appellant desired to change underpinning to wood in certain portions above the grade. The building rested upon a lot which pitched sharply to the rear so that a considerable portion of the basement was above grade. The building was but one story high above the basement and was well isolated. The Board was of the opinion that the strength and stability of the building was not impaired by allowing the appellant to build exposed basement walls of studding and believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board, therefore, sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2401.

July 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2296.

CASE No. 2402.

July 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2395.

CASE No. 2403.

*(Violation of Sections 9 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

July 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter buildings as same were of third-class construction within the fire limits and proposed addition came within 5 feet of the lot lines. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to build open piazzas and stairways at the rear end of dwelling houses of third-class construction in a block. The houses were already on the lot line and had but one means of egress. The proposed piazzas were but 8 feet by 18 feet. In view of the fact that proposed additions would improve conditions by providing a second means of egress, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2404.

*(Violation of Sections 9, 13 and 20, Chapter 550, Acts
of 1907, as Amended.)*

July 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed construction was of third-class construction within the building limits, roofing material was not legal and foundation loads were not carried down to satisfactory bearing materials. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a temporary structure 47 feet by 23 feet on filled land for the housing of dories and vessel gear during the hot months. Owing to its temporary nature, its location, size and the purpose for which it was to be used, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2405.

July 8, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2404.

CASE No. 2406.

July 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2407.

(Violation of Section 23, Paragraph 5, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907.)

July 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed walls were not of the legal thickness. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was a one-family dwelling house of second-class construction in a block. The appellant desired to construct an additional story. The party walls only were bearing walls, being 8 feet and 12 feet, respectively. The appellant desired to carry up the existing party walls, using same as bearing walls. The span was small, being but 18 inches, and the present 8-inch wall had been standing for many years. The Board was of the opinion that there would be no risk involved by allowing the appellant to carry the 8-inch wall up one story and believed, under the circumstances, that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board, therefore, sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2408.

August 5, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to comply with the following requirements of the elevator and escalator regulations, chapter 836, Acts of 1913: Install shipper rope lock and ball stop; interlock street gate; install light in car; install call bell; test safeties with load in presence of inspector.

The Board, having heard the appellant and having examined the plans, was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner was justified in his order and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2409.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

July 26, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same would be an increase in area of a mercantile

building. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of second-class construction. The first floor was divided into two large areas by a brick wall and the appellant desired to remove same. The Board made a careful examination of the premises and found that the wall in question did not run through the roof but ran up a distance of 10 feet, the remaining space between the top of the wall and the ceiling of the first floor being of skylight construction. The wall was pierced with openings at various points, the openings being protected by self-closing fireproof doors. The construction of the wall was such that the Board did not feel that it would be any protection in case of fire; in fact, it believed that conditions as to egress and safety would be improved if the appellant were allowed to remove same, provided skylights, which were of plain glass, were glazed with wire glass. The skylight in question was at the second floor level and formed the bottom of a brick walled shaft running from the second floor to the roof; these walls evidently were old exterior walls. The installation of wire glass would provide an effective shut-off and prevent fire gaining headway in the well above the skylight. With the proviso that "skylights in question are glazed with wire glass," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2410.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

July 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same would be an extension of area of a third-class building within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a double house of third-class construction, three stories high, divided by a brick party wall and occupied by two families. The appellant desires to extend the ground area of the building in making apartment on each of the three floors. The plans showed the walls of the court in the rear of same of wooden construction. The Board believed that if these walls were made of brick corresponding to the brick party wall and carried to the rear wall of the building, thus forming an entire brick walled court, that no hazard would be incurred by allowing the appellant to make proposed alterations. With the proviso "that walls of court are made of brick corresponding to the

existing brick party wall and carried to rear wall of building," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2411.

July 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2412.

(Violation of Section 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

July 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as proposed egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was a garage of first-class construction. A portion of the garage was carried up to the second floor, and was to be used as a machine shop. The egress from this was by one flight of stairs leading to the interior portion of the first floor. The second floor windows opened directly on the flat roof of the one-story portion of the building. The Board was of the opinion that if two of these openings were provided with casements so that same could be readily opened, thus giving access to the roof, the large room on the second floor would be provided with ample egress. Moreover, there was an emergency exit in the shape of a block and tackle used for unloading materials. With the proviso that "two of the second floor window openings are provided with casement," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2413.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

July 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building of third-class construction as same was within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was occupied by three families and the appellant desired to change the front room of the first floor into a store. There was to be no access from the store to the dwelling portion of the building. In view of the fact that the building was in a location rapidly changing into a mercantile establishment and that the ceiling and walls

were to be protected by means of wire lath and cement plaster, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2414.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907.)

July 26, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2415.

July 26, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2243.

CASE No. 2416.

(Violation of Sections 23 and 32, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907.)

July 26, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect a second-class building as external walls were illegal and structural members were not fireproofed. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a small one-story structure of steel frame, covered with galvanized iron. It was in an isolated position and was to be used as an office for a filling station and was of a temporary nature. Owing to the size, 9 feet by 11 feet, its location and the purpose for which it was to be used, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2417.

July 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2416.

CASE No. 2418.

July 26, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to use basement store for vulcanizing and repairing tires. It appeared that the building in question was of second-class construction, occupied as a store and a lodging house. The appellant desires to install a vulcanizing machine which will be provided with an automatic gas regulator similar to those which are being used in adjoining basement

stores. In view of all conditions, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit under the circumstances and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2419.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

July 26, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed construction was of third-class construction within the fire limits and was less than 5 feet from lot line without a brick wall. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a shed 19 feet by 58 feet. A permit was granted to repair same but the appellant found on starting that the old material was not sufficiently strong so he practically rebuilt the entire structure without a permit on the old foundations. The area of the building was not increased and the outside walls, which were of studding, were covered with cement plaster on metal lathing. There were windows on the end elevation and these were of metal and wire-glass. Practically the entire frontage of 58 feet was open with the exception of 8 feet. The building had a tar and gravel roof and the construction was very much superior to the former construction. In view of all conditions, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2420.

July 26, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove asphalt rolled roofing on his building as same was in violation of the provisions of section 13, and had been roofed without a permit. In order to sustain the appeal the Board would have to vary the above provisions of section 13, which could only be done by the unanimous vote of the Board. Owing to the inability of the Board to unanimously agree on varying the law in this particular instance, it was compelled to dismiss the appeal.

CASES No. 2421 to No. 2423.

June 30, 1921.

Cases void because of passage of new law governing sprinklers.

CASE No. 2424.

Violation of Sections 13 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907.

August 1, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction and would come within 5 feet of the side lot line and also because he desired to cover proposed dormer with clapboards instead of asphalt shingles. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was two and one half stories high with a hipped roof. The appellant desired to extend rear stairs to attic so as to provide two ways of egress from attic. This necessitated building a dormer on roof of ell to inclose proposed stairway and passage to attic. The side of the building on which the appellant desired to build dormer was but 3 feet from the side lot line. Owing to the minor character of proposed alteration and the fact that the building was already within 5 feet of the line, the Board sustained the appeal with reference to section 40. With reference to the covering of dormers, the Board concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal with reference to section 13.

CASE No. 2425.

(Violation of Sections 9, 13, 39 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 1, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits; roofing material was illegal as well as foundation and same was in excess of legal area and was not to be covered with incombustible material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was one story high with a pitched roof covered with paroid roof material. It was to be located in Soldiers' Field, opposite Harvard University Boathouse, and was to be used for stable for eighty-four horses and equipment. It had a frontage of 90 feet and was 130 feet deep. It was well isolated, being 50 feet from the front lot line, 900 feet and 1,200 feet from side lot lines, respectively, and 800 feet from rear lot line. The building was to be used in connection with instructing artillery forces, similar to the work done at Camp Devens,

and was to be carefully guarded and protected at all hours of the day and night. The Board believed that this case should be regarded as a special case and, owing to the temporary nature and purpose for which it was to be used, was of the opinion that no risk would be incurred by allowing appellants to construct same. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2426.

August 1, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2366.

CASE No. 2427.

Withdrawn.

CASE No. 2428.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 1, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction and would come within 5 feet of the side lot line. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was two stories high and the appellant desired to build a bay window one story high. The side of the present building was 2 feet from lot line, and owing to the narrow frontage of the house and location of the doorway it was impossible for the appellant to keep the addition 5 feet away from the side lot line. Owing to the minor character of the proposed alteration the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2429.

August 1, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2395.

CASE No. 2430.

(Violation of the Provisions of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 5, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same would come within 5 feet of the side lot line. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a three-family dwelling house with three piazzas at the rear of same, the upper

one being uncovered. The appellant desired to protect this by a roof. The piazzas at present constructed had been in existence at least four years. The Board did not consider that any advantage to the buildings would be gained by dividing the piazzas at the third floors by means of a party wall and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2431.

August 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2299.

CASE No. 2432.

August 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2416.

CASE No. 2433.

August 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2416.

CASE No. 2434.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 5, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter first-class building as same would exceed the legal area of 2,200 square feet and was not covered with incombustible material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was occupied as a police station and it had been built for many years and already exceeded the legal area. The appellant desired to add 300 square feet at the first floor level of the building in order to provide a recreation room. The Board was of the opinion that the fire hazard would not be increased by the proposed addition and therefore believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2435.

August 10, 1921.

Withdrawn.

CASE No. 2436.

(Violation of Sections 20, 23 and 32, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 10, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as external walls were of illegal thickness, structural

members were not fireproofed and foundations were not carried down to satisfactory bearing material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of structural steel covered with corrugated iron and was to be occupied as a shop and protection for car haul engine. Same was 850 feet from street line and was to be erected on old filled wharf. The building was 48 feet by 20 feet and was situated on a lot 179 feet by 1,340 feet. In view of the temporary nature of the building, its isolated position and the purpose for which it was to be used, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the provisions of sections 20, 23 and 32, and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2437.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 10, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to change a four-story wooden tenement house and store in old fire limits to use for church purposes. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of third-class construction with two means of egress. The first floor, which was occupied by two stores, was level with the street and the appellant desired to remove the present partition between the two stores to provide for the temporary accommodation of a small church congregation, it being its intention to build a new first-class church as soon as conditions permitted. The Board believed the proposed change of occupancy would not increase the existing fire hazard and therefore with the proviso "that premises in question be discontinued for church purposes at the expiration of three years," sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2438.

(Violation of Section 13, Paragraph 22, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 10, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to omit wired glass in show window as same was less than 5 feet to the side lot line. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of brick with slate roof, oc-

cupied for store and office. The appellant desired to substitute clear, polished plate glass for wired glass in front bay window, which was within 5 feet of the lot line. The lines of the shop in question follow the line of the bay window in the second story. The Board was of the opinion that there would be no more hazard in allowing the clear glass in this type of window than in the usual front store window and believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2439.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

August 10, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to make repairs and alterations to church as same would be of third-class construction within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to reduce the size of the present front porch of his church and, in order to simplify the ornamental tower, wished to square same near the top. The entire sides were to be protected with cement plaster and wire lathing. The wooden gutters were to be replaced with metal and slate substituted for shingles on roof; the exterior steps were to be of masonry instead of wood. The Board believed that the proposed alterations were of a nature to improve materially the present condition of the building, making it less of a hazard, and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2440.

August 10, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2416.

CASE No. 2441.

*(Violation of Section 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

August 16, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed foundation of new wall was not carried down to satisfactory bearing material. It appeared at the hearing that owing to the widening of the street on which the building faced, the appellant was obliged to set

back his present front wall for a distance of about 10 feet. No addition to the rear of the building was made and the appellant desired to go to the same depth and rest on the same bearing material as the old wall. In view of the fact that the front wall was not a bearing wall and the building had been standing many years, and that furthermore the load on foundation was not to be increased, the Board believed there would be no danger in allowing the proposed foundation to start at the same depth as the present foundation and was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to carry the foundations to a lower level than the original ones. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2442.

(Violation of Section 9, Paragraph 2, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 16, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building from a one family dwelling house to a three family. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of third-class construction and the appellant desired to put up two new partitions, cut four doors, put in skylight on top floor and provide a fire escape from top floor in rear, thus giving accommodations for three families. In view of the character of the proposed alteration, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2443.

August 16, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2350.

CASE No. 2444.

August 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2416.

CASE No. 2445.

August 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2369.

CASE No. 2446.

Pending.

CASE No. 2447.

August 19, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to provide adequate fire-escapes on his building in accordance with the provisions of section 12, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was used as a day nursery and was one and one half stories high. The first floor was just above the street level and the children occupied the building only during the day. There were but three rooms on the second floor and only one of these was occupied by the children. The Board was of the opinion that the egress as at present provided was sufficient and therefore acting under its discretionary power annulled the order of the Building Commissioner.

CASE No. 2448.

(Violation of Section 40, Paragraph 2, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building of third-class construction as same would come within 5 feet of the lot line, and was not covered in incombustible material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a wagon and hay shed 50 feet by 40 feet. One side of same came directly on lot line adjoining line of Boston Elevated Railway Company. The plan showed the exterior frame covered with rubberoid. The building was well isolated, being 150 feet back from the street line. The Board believed that if "the exterior walls were covered with corrugated iron that the spirit of the law would be complied with." With this proviso the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2449.

Pending.

CASE No. 2450.

August 26, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2392.

CASE No. 2451.

(Violation of Section 13, Paragraph 22, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 12, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to amend plans of building as part of second-class building would come nearer than 5 feet to lot line without a brick wall. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the appellant desired to erect a penthouse above the roof line of the building for the housing of elevator machinery, constructing same of studding protected on the exterior with copper. The wall toward the lot line was but 8 feet long and a construction of this size used as a dormer would be a legal second-class structure. In view of the above the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASES No. 2452 TO No. 2458.

June 30, 1921.

Cases void because of passage of new law governing sprinklers.

CASE No. 2459.

Pending.

CASE No. 2460.

(Violation of Sections 9, 13 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 12, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter a third-class building within the fire limits as same contemplated an extension of area and it already had an area of 2,200 square feet. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a three-family dwelling house and the appellant desired to erect a store on the first floor. The area of the building was increased by an addition of about 80 square feet, the front window of the store being brought out to the lot line a distance of 5 feet. The building already exceeded the legal area but it was situated on a corner. There was to be no cellar under the store and no opening from store to basement. The Board believed that "if all studded walls were brick-nogged," that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2461.

September 12, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2462.

September 12, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2460.

CASE No. 2463.

September 28, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2460.

CASE No. 2464.

*(Violation of Section 13, Paragraph 21, Chapter 550,
Acts of 1907, as Amended.)*

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed roofing material was not in accordance with the provisions of above-mentioned section. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was situated inside the old fire limits and the appellant desired to replace existing wooden shingles with asphalt shingles, such as are allowed outside the old fire limits. There were not more than five and one half squares on the roof. The Board was of the opinion that the fire hazard would be decreased by the proposed alteration and in view of the small size of the house believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2465.

September 12, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2464.

CASE No. 2466.

September 12, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2425.

CASE No. 2467.

September 12, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2425.

CASE No. 2468.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 31, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter second-class building as first-class construction of walls and floors separating the portion to be converted into use for mercantile purposes was to be omitted. It appeared that the proposed alteration consisted in converting a small basement room, 8 feet by 12 feet, into a tailor shop. A gas iron was to be installed and repairing only was to be done. The room was to be occupied by only one workman. In view of the fact that the original plans showed this room to be an office and owing to its size and the purpose for which it was to be used, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2469.

(Violation of Sections 12 and 42 to 76, Inclusive, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner and proposed alteration would not be in conformity with the tenement house regulations. The Board, having heard the appellant and having examined the plans, concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2470.

(Violation of Section 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 12, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of first-class construction, eight stories high and was provided with a fire-escape as a second means of egress. The appellant desired to increase the height of building one story. In a previous decision of the Board the appellant was permitted to

use fire escape as a second means of egress with the proviso "that all runs and balconies were protected with heavy wire grille 5 feet high and that fireproof self-closing doors and frames were provided to same from each floor, said doors, if glazed, to be of wire glass." The Board believed that if fire escape was extended one story and was protected in manner proposed by Board in previous decision that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the above proviso, therefore, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2471.

(Violation of Sections 13 and 58, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

August 31, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as part of second-class building was nearer than 5 feet to lot line and openings in same were not protected with metal frames, also the outer court was less than 6 feet wide. It appeared at the hearing that the foundation had been in place about five years, having been constructed after plans approved by the Building Commissioner at that time. The superstructure which the appellant proposed to build on the existing foundation was to be four stories high, instead of five as originally planned. While technically the building as planned did not conform strictly to the provisions of section 58, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 58. With reference to section 13, the Board understands that this referred to glass in bay windows within five feet of the lot line. The Board believed that the section did not apply to this case and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2472.

Pending.

CASE No. 2473.

(Violation of Section 40, Paragraph 3, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 12, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to place two wooden garages nearer than 10 feet apart as same would

violate the spirit of the law. It appeared at the hearing that the buildings were garages of third-class construction which came nearer than 10 feet to each other but one garage was used for storage purposes and did not come within 5 feet of the side lot lines. The appellant had partly completed his building before he was aware he was violating the law. In view of the above the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2474.

Pending.

CASE No. 2475.

(Violation of Sections 16, 20, 23 and 32, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 12, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as thickness of metal proposed was less than $\frac{1}{4}$ inch in thickness, foundation loads were not to be carried down to a satisfactory bearing material, thickness of external walls were illegal and the appellant desired to omit fire-proofing of structural members. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner was justified in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2476.

September 12, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2425.

CASE No. 2477.

September 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to install a cooker in a third-class building as same would be in violation of the provisions of section 12, paragraph 15, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. The Board having heard the appellant and having received a report from the building inspector as to the fire risk concurred with the Building Commissioner in his decision and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2478.

*(Violation of Section 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

September 12, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of second-class construction and the appellant desired to change stairway leading directly to the street so that it would lead directly to the first floor of the building. The appellant occupied the entire building. The Board believed that the building as altered would provide reasonable means of egress and under the circumstances, was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2479.

*(Violation of Sections 9, 13 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of
1907, as Amended.)*

September 23, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits, came within 5 feet of the side lot line without being protected with a brick wall and alteration contemplated an extension of area. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was two and one half stories high and 19 feet wide, occupied by three families. The appellant desired to change pitched roof to flat in order to make existing rooms on the third story more habitable and to build new piazzas with stairs in rear, thus providing a second means of egress. As the proposed alterations would materially change the living conditions for the betterment of the occupants, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2480.

September 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2479.

CASE No. 2481.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits and proposed alteration contemplated an extension of area. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a dwelling house and the appellant desired to lower a portion of the first story and use for store purposes, also to build show window addition to the front and piazzas at rear of house for egress. The front extension is but 3 feet by 15 feet and 13 feet high. The interior walls of the store are to be brick-nogged between studding and covered with wire lath and plastered on both sides. There was only one opening to store from dwelling house and this was to be protected by a metal self-closing door. The Board believed that if "masonry wall was constructed in basement immediately below the brick-nogged store partitions of store, thus cutting off the dwelling portion of the house from store" that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the above proviso, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASES No. 2482 to No. 2484.

(Violation of Sections 45 and 65, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect three buildings in a block as proposed lighting of public halls was illegal and location of incombustible staircase and inclosure was not as designated by Building Commissioner. It appeared at the hearing that the buildings in question were of second-class construction located on the corner of two streets. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2485.

(Violation of Sections 20, 23 and 32, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect steel building in the heart of the business section as founda-

tion loads were not to be carried down to satisfactory bearing material, proposed thickness of outside walls were illegal and the appellant desired to omit fireproofing of structural members. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his decision and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASES No. 2486 TO No. 2489.

Pending.

CASE No. 2490.

(Violation of Section 40, Paragraph 2, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 12, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as proposed alteration contemplated an increase of the legal area of 2,200 square feet allowed for a building of this type. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was occupied by stores on the first floor and office above. The appellant desired to build a small addition at the rear of one of the stores thus giving room for an oven. Same was to be built of semifireproof construction, the exterior walls being of 8-inch concrete block with concrete foundation, and was to be but 10 feet by 19 feet with a flat roof covered with tar and gravel. The Board believed that "if rear partition against which the appellant proposed to build was brick-nogged and also that opening in same was protected with self-closing fireproof doors," that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. Therefore with the above proviso the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2491.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 12, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to move third-class building to a new location inside the old fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a small wooden frame structure covered with metal and the appellant desired to move same to a small lot in front of a portion of an existing store, using it for a show window in connection with a basement store. In

view of the size and nature of the building, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2492.

(Violation of Section 83, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building by installing an additional door below stage level as, same would be in violation of the theater laws. It appeared that the appellant desired to install an extra door opening in proscenium wall under stage to provide a more effective means of egress. The appellant had already cut same through curtain wall without knowing permit was necessary but closed up same as soon as notified by the Building Department. It was this same opening that he wished to re-open. In view of all conditions, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2493.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as same would exceed the 3,500 square feet of superficial area allowed for a building of this type. It appeared at the hearing that in a former appeal the Board ruled in favor of the appellant and granted a permit to erect buildings on present foundations. It now appeared that the old foundation provided for a building 300 square feet in excess of the legal area. The superstructure was advanced on present foundation before the appellant was aware of a violation. In view of all conditions, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2494.

September 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building of second-class construction as proposed floors and walls separating the portion used for mercantile purposes from

that portion used for habitation was not of first-class construction as required by the provisions of section 17, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, also because proposed foundations were not carried down to satisfactory bearing material. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2495.

September 23, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2243.

CASE No. 2496.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same contemplated a change of occupancy of a dwelling to a store and dwelling in the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a two-family dwelling house and the appellant desired to construct a small store of second-class construction in place of front piazza. The addition forming store was not going to encroach on existing cellar, but was to be completely cut off from the cellar of the house proper by a metal door. In view of the above, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2497.

September 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2307.

CASE No. 2498.

September 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2299.

CASE No. 2499.

October 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2500.

(Violation of Section 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to move third-class building from outside the building limits to premises inside the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to place building in the heart of the business section. The Board concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2501.

September 23, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2299.

CASE No. 2502.

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect first-class building as same did not conform to the provisions of chapter 342, Special Acts of 1911. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2503.

(Violation of Section 53, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to install an oven and establish a bakery in a tenement house. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2504.

September 23, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2493.

CASES No. 2505 TO No. 2507.

(Violation of Section 65, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect buildings as proposed lighting of halls was illegal. It appeared

at the hearing that the appellant had arranged to light the public halls which adjoined the main staircase halls by means of glazed doorways between the staircase hall and the public hall. This staircase hall is well lighted by a large skylight and the Board believed that the method provided for lighting the halls was ample and that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. Therefore acting under its discretionary power, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2508.

(Violation of Sections 13 and 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building of third-class construction as proposed alteration contemplated second-class construction nearer than 5 feet from the lot line without masonry wall and egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to construct three-story rear piazzas with steel posts and girders. While it appeared that the sides of the proposed piazzas came within 5 feet of the side lot lines, they were open and were of semi-fireproof construction and conditions were such that they could not be placed in any other position, but the use of solid wall along the sides would defeat the purpose for which they were constructed. The Board agreed with the appellant that this is a case not contemplated by the law though covered by it and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 13. With reference to section 12, the Board having heard the appellant concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2509.

(Violation of Sections 13 and 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building within the fire limits; alteration also contemplated an extension of area. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was two and one half stories high, occupied as a residence. The appellant was ordered by the Building Department

to add a fire escape and he desired to add a side entrance and sun room at the same time, thus increasing the area 64 square feet. It appeared, however, that the proposed sun room would afford another means of egress from the second floor. In view of the minor character of the proposed alteration, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2510.

*(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building by converting same for use as a mercantile establishment, as proposed floors and walls separating the mercantile portion from the habitation was not of first-class construction as required in a tenement house. The Board having heard the appellant was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner was justified in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2511.

*(Violation of Section 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

September 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect a three-car garage of first-class construction as proposed foundation was on a filled wharf and the appellant desired to use concrete spread footings instead of a bearing as prescribed by law. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the foundations carried the roof and walls only. At the hearing samples of borings made by the Charles Gow Company were submitted for consideration of the Board. After careful examination of the material and figures indicating bearing capacity of same, the Board believed that no danger would be incurred in allowing the appellant to construct spread foundations, as proposed, on existing soil and believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit under the circumstances. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2512.

September 28, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2490.

CASE No. 2513.

September 28, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2514.

October 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2413.

CASE No. 2515.

(Violation of Sections 17 and 23, Paragraph 6, Chapter. 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

September 30, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter second-class building into use for a mercantile establishment as first floor and basement stories were not of first-class construction and thickness of walls were illegal. It appeared at the hearing that one half of the roof was flat, and the remainder was pitched. The appellant desired to build on extension of the present flat roof over the portion with sloping roof, carrying up portion of front and rear walls to correspond to existing walls and provide an additional story in flat roof portion. These alterations would increase the extreme height of this portion of the building about $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet. The existing exterior walls were to be extended with tile, covered on the outside with galvanized iron. The first floor of the building had been occupied by stores for many years. In view of all conditions the Board believed it a manifest injustice to require the appellant to fireproof the first floor and therefore sustained the appeal in this particular. With reference to section 23, the Board believed that while the walls provided did not conform strictly to the provisions of this section that they were of sufficient strength to carry the loads and in view of this believed that it would be a manifest injustice to have to increase the thickness of the existing masonry walls and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2516.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 5, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as proposed egress was not satisfactory to

the Commissioner and same was within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a one-family house and the appellant desired to install a store on the first floor. The studded walls surrounding the store were to be brick-nogged and covered with wire lath and cement plaster and the ceiling of the store also was to be wire lathed. The Board believed that "if the portion of the basement directly below the store is cut off from the remainder of the basement by means of terra-cotta walls or other masonry," that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and with the above proviso sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2517.

*(Violation of Section 11, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

September 30, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect stud partitions in first-class building. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to divide the fifth floor of the building into various rooms for the carrying on of United States government work. Some of these partitions were to run to the ceiling and were to be of fireproof construction; others averaged 7 feet in height and were of the usual type of temporary office partitions. The Board believed that this type of partition did not constitute a permanent structural part of the building but should be considered more in the nature of office appurtenance and therefore, under the circumstances, believed it a manifest injustice to compel the appellant to conform strictly to the above-mentioned provisions. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2518.

October 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2395.

CASE No. 2519.

*(Violation of Sections 9, 13 and 35, Chapter 550, Acts of
1907, as Amended.)*

October 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits and proposed alterations contemplated an increase of area

and the Commissioner believed that same would increase the fire risk as a whole and that structure should be made to conform to the provisions of this act for a new structure of same class. The Board, having examined the plans and having heard the appellant, concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2520.

(Violation of Section 40, Paragraph 3, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 5, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same would exceed the legal 2,200 square feet in area and was not to be covered with incombustible material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was occupied as a store and a passageway of 4 feet in width separated same from the brick wall of an adjoining building. The appellant desired to increase the area of the store by including in same this passageway by removing the present exterior wall and building a side wall of brick with 12-inch piers every 10 feet. A wide yard in the rear gave good egress. The Board agreed with the appellant that the hazard was lessened by the proposed alteration and therefore believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2521.

October 19, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to install a vent shaft by the Board of Health. The law required that he run same the full length of the house, but he desired to construct same directly over the new bathroom, as that was the only room it was to serve. The Board believed that the spirit of the law would be compiled with "if he covered the interior of the proposed well with wire lath and cement plaster" and under the circumstances believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the above proviso therefore the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2522.

October 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2304.

CASE No. 2523.

October 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2304.

CASE No. 2524.

(Violation of Section 4, Acts of 1905, as Amended.)

September 30, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as same exceeded the 125 feet in height. The Board found that the appeal was in violation of a special act which was not in amendment of chapter 550, of the Acts of 1907, nor in any other way incorporated therein, over which the Board had no jurisdiction. The Board was, therefore, obliged to dismiss the appeal.

CASE No. 2525.

October 5, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2296.

CASE No. 2526.

(Violation of Sections 9, 13 and 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 7, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the fire limits; roofing material was illegal, and foundation loads were not carried down to satisfactory bearing material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a two-story building used as a detention hospital by the City of Boston. The appellant desired to make certain alterations, including the installation of isolation rooms bathrooms, staircases, porch, etc., construction of foundation walls, leveling up building and general repairs. An extension 11 feet wide by 22 feet long, one story high, was to be made. The building was only to be used in case of emergency but it was the desire of the appellant to make the building more habitable in case a necessity arose, and was to be only of a temporary nature. In view of the above conditions the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore acting under its discretionary power sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2527.

October 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2229.

CASE No. 2528.

October 7, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2395.

CASE No. 2529.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 7, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter second-class building as the appellant proposed to build extension of third-class construction. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a small one-car garage and the appellant desired to increase the depth of same to accommodate a longer car by building a bay at the rear of the building 6 feet by 8 feet, which was to be covered on the exterior with metal. The present roof being covered with shingles, the owner intended to replace same. In view of all conditions, the Board is of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2530.

October 5, 1921.

Withdrawn.

CASE No. 2531.

(Violation of Section 52, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to install bakers' oven in building as same was not to be fireproof as required in a tenement house. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to install an oven in a store located in a house of second-class construction. The room in which oven was to be used was to be protected by brick-nogging between partition studding, wire lathing and plastering the ceiling on bakery side, also partition around cellar staircase to side brick wall,

strap ceiling of the entire bakeshop, wire lath and plaster three-coat work and provide self-closing metal doors between store and bakeshop as well as entrance to cellar,—all work to be done to the satisfaction of the Building Commissioner. The Board believed that “if a metal sheet iron plate 8 feet square was placed from the center of ash pit of oven,” that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the above proviso the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2532.

October 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2243.

CASE No. 2533.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 35, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building of third-class construction as same contemplated a change of occupancy of a wooden tenement house in the fire limits to store and tenements, and in the opinion of the commissioner the alterations to be made increased the fire risk of the structure as a whole and therefore would be in violation of the provisions of sections 9 and 35, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. The Board, having heard the appellant and having examined the plans, concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and dismissed the appeal.

CASES No. 2534 to No. 2537.

Pending.

CASE No. 2538.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect a third-class building as same would be a wooden construction within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of a temporary nature, 10 feet by 30 feet by 65 feet, inclosed on three sides and was to be used for the storage of flat poles and spars. Same was to be built on wharf, there was to be no floor, the foundation of building carrying walls and roof only. There was to be no heat in the building as same was

merely for the protection of poles from the weather. In view of the character of the proposed building, and the fact that it was well isolated, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2539.

(Violation of Sections 9, 13, 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same would be an extension of area of wooden construction within the fire limits and it already exceeded the legal area for a building of this type. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was used as a clubhouse with bowling alleys in the basement. The appellant desired to construct one more bowling alley adjoining those at present installed. This ell was in the rear of the building and was but 8 feet by 16 feet by 10 feet and was only one story high. Owing to the small size of the addition, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2540.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as building exceeded 2,200 square feet in area and was not to be covered on the exterior with incombustible material. It appeared at the hearing that the alteration in question consisted of the inclosing of a part of a rear piazza into a room; the outside of proposed addition will be covered with wire and cement stucco. In view of the nature of same, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2541.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 1, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove wooden building erected within the fire limits without a permit. It

appeared at the hearing that there was an old frame of a shed standing in the rear of the appellant's house and the appellant boarded in same to house two carriages he had to use as he was a disabled soldier and had lost one leg. Owing to the small size of the structure and purpose for which it was used, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to require the appellant to remove same in view of existing conditions and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2542.

October 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2540.

CASE No. 2543.

November 1, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove work done in violation of section 12 and section 40, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended, to wit, roof covering illegal and building was erected within 5 feet of the lot line. "The records show that the service of the Building Commissioner's order was made on the appellant July 5, 1921, and the appeal from said order was made on October 7, 1921, which is beyond the time limit allowed for such appeal by section 7, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. The appeal not having been made within the period required by law, the Board is advised that it has no jurisdiction over this matter." The appeal was accordingly dismissed.

CASE No. 2544.

October 19, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove violation of section 40, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended, existing on his premises, to wit, said building had been erected within three feet of the lot line. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a small one-car garage which had been in place for more than nine years. It was erected under a permit from the Building Department and was then less than 3 feet from the side lot line, the exact location of the line not having been taken under consideration. In view of the circumstances the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to remove same and therefore annulled the order of the Building Commissioner.

CASE No. 2545.

October 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2395.

CASE No. 2546.

(Violation of Section 105, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 19, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect first-class building as the church would hold more than 800 persons and the mean level of the main floor was more than 5 feet above the grade of adjacent street. It appeared at the hearing that the level of the main floor was less than 5 feet, but the building, a church, set back from the street and the actual conditions were such that the grade in front of main entrance was above the grade of the street and the first floor was considerably less than 5 feet above the exterior grade. The Board believed that this was a case not contemplated by the law though covered by same, and that the building was arranged to comply with the spirit of the law and therefore, acting under its discretionary power, it sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2547.

(Violation of Sections 23 and 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed wall was illegal without a foundation. It appeared at the hearing that the wall in question was a temporary nonbearing wall of terra cotta 6 inches thick and was to be removed when the building was to be extended. It rested on a granolithic floor. In view of the temporary nature of same, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to require the appellant to conform strictly to the provisions of sections 20 and 23, and therefore acting under its discretionary power sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2548.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect a third-class building as same was other than a one or two family

dwelling house within the building limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a 20-foot by 40-foot shelter, open on one side and was to be used for the protection of pipes and machinery, etc., from the weather. There was to be no floor and the only inclosed side is one 20 feet long on the sidewalk line which is now a fence. This portion the appellant proposed to cover on the exterior with metal. The Board believed that the metal covering would be more effective on the interior of the external wall, and believed that if this were done it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. Therefore with the proviso "that the interior of the wooden wall was covered with metal," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2549.

October 28, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2413.

CASE No. 2550.

(Violation of Section 17, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building of second-class construction into a store and having dwellings for several families above same, as portion separating habitation from that used for mercantile purposes was not to be of first-class construction. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner was justified in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2551.

October 24, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2242.

CASE No. 2552.

October 24, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2229.

CASE No. 2553.

October 24, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2350.

CASE No. 2554.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

October 24, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction and was within the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a two-family dwelling house of third-class construction, but the plumbing was very inadequate, there being only one toilet in the basement. The appellant desired to change the house to a three-family dwelling, having a bathroom and additional egress from each story. In view of the fact that existing conditions would be much improved, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2555.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as
Amended.)*

November 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to change a three-family dwelling of third-class construction into a store and dwelling house as same was within the fire limits and the fire hazard would be increased. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2556.

October 28, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2306.

CASE No. 2557.

October 28, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2554.

CASE No. 2558.

*(Violation of Section 55, Paragraph 5, Chapter 550,
Acts of 1907, as Amended.)*

October 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to change occupancy of building which was a dwelling house into a tenement house as area of yard for same would be

illegal. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of second-class construction, situated on the corner of two streets. While the yard at the rear of the building did not conform strictly to the provisions of section 55, there was a space at the rear 4 feet 4 inches to the lot line and in addition to this a space 4 feet 4 inches, which spaces together form a passageway 8 feet 8 inches wide, and which was always to remain open; moreover, there was a large inner court at one corner of the lot, so that the number of square feet of yard space exceeded that required by law. The law required an area of 318 square feet and the actual area was 390 square feet. In view of the fact that the existing exposure provided the equivalent of exposure required, the Board believed that the spirit of the law had been complied with and therefore it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2559.

(Violation of Sections 23 and 32, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

October 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed thickness of external walls were illegal and he desired to omit fireproofing of structural members. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was six stories in height and was of first-class construction with the exception of the roof which was of second-class. The appellant desired to erect a roof house on same constructed of metal frame and galvanized iron with steel walls and roof, the whole structure being supported on the present roof construction. The structure will replace an existing canvas structure of the identical size. In view of all conditions, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2560.

October 28, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2561.

November 8, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove violation of section 45, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, existing in his

building, to wit, "The distance between wall and railing of rear stairs was less than 3 feet." The appellant maintained that the stairs having been completed should be allowed to remain. The Board, however, concurred with the Building Commissioner in his order and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2562.

November 1, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2563.

November 1, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2413.

CASE No. 2564.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 1, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as same was within the building limits. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was occupied by three families. The appellant desired to straighten out roof and build a new brick front. There was to be no change in the occupancy of the building and that portion of the ground area which was to be increased was to be built of second-class construction. In view of the nature of the proposed alteration and the great improvement it would be to the building, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2565.

(Violation of Section 40, Paragraph 2, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 3, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as proposed alteration contemplated an extension of area exceeding the legal 3,000 square feet in superficial area and was not to be covered with incombustible material. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to make a small extension 15 feet by 25 feet in the form of a shelter for a conveyor of paper stock to facilitate the handling of stock from the street. Owing

to the minor character of the proposed alteration and purposes for which it was to be used, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to compel the appellant to conform strictly to the provisions of the above-mentioned section and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASES No. 2566 and No. 2567.

Pending.

CASE No. 2568.

December 14, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to install sprinklers in his buildings, also vent and dumb waiter shafts, and stairways be inclosed in basement or cellar by masonry walls not less than 8 inches thick in accordance with the provisions of section 45, chapter 550, Acts of 1907 as amended by chapter 550, Acts of 1920. It appeared at the hearing that there was an opening in the basement between the two buildings. The Board believed that "if this opening was protected with metal covered, self-closing doors as required by law" that this building should be considered as a separate building not having over ten suites. With this proviso the Board sustained the appeal with reference to 50 Staniford street. With reference to building on premises 58 to 66 Green street, the building inspector reported that there were over ten families occupying this building. The Board, therefore, concurred with the Building Commissioner in his order and dismissed the appeal with reference to building on premises 58 to 66 Green street.

CASE No. 2569.

December 14, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to install sprinklers in his building, also that vent and dumb waiter shafts and stairways be inclosed in basement or cellar by masonry walls not less than 8 inches thick in accordance with the provisions of section 45, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended by chapter 440, Acts of 1920. The building inspector testified at the hearing of the Board that there were over ten families living in said building. The Board also heard the appellant and believed that the Building Commissioner was justified in his order. It therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2570.

(Violation of Section 38, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter second-class building as he desired to install a vent shaft which was not in accordance with the above-mentioned section. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to erect a vent shaft of wood studding, brick-nogging between same and covering with wire lath and plaster on the inside. The vent shaft started at the third-story level and extended through the fifth story. The Board believed that this was a case not contemplated by the law although covered by it and therefore acting under its discretionary power sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2571.

(Violation of Section 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed foundations were not carried down to satisfactory bearing material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a garage of second-class construction 98 feet by 110 feet. The appellant desired to use spread footing under foundation wall. Samples of borings made by the Charles Gow Company for the consideration of the Board were shown. After careful examination of the material and figures indicating bearing capacity of same, the Board was of the opinion that no danger would be incurred in allowing the appellant to construct spread foundations as proposed on existing soil and believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2572.

November 8, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2413.

CASE No. 2573 AND No. 2574.

Pending.

CASE No. 2575.

Pending.

CASE No. 2576.

November 8, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to change the occupancy of his building from two families to five families as same would be in violation of the provisions of section 9 and 42 to 76, inclusive, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a large two-family dwelling house, two and one half stories high. The appellant desired to adapt same for use by five families and no alteration of any kind was contemplated other than the installation of additional gas meters. It appeared that the building was already occupied by five families. The house was well adapted for a number of small families, being unusually large and well ventilated. In view of the housing conditions the Board believed it a manifest injustice to require these tenants to vacate the premises because of the application of additional gas meters and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2577.

(Violation of Sections 12 and 14, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed stress in balcony joists (spruce) exceeded 1,000 pounds per square inch and the timbers were not framed in the meaning of the law. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a church of third-class construction. In constructing the balcony the 8-inch joists carrying balcony platforms were notched slightly at a point near the balcony railing, reducing the width of joists at one point $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The balcony was already constructed before the appellant discovered he was in error. The Board believed that the balcony as constructed was sufficient to carry any imposed load by fixed seats as proposed and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 14. In regard to the manner of supporting the joists at the outer end of the balcony, the appellant explained to the Board that this was done by spiking the 2 by 4 timbers to the side of a

4 by 12 timber and resting the balcony joists on same; also spiking the joists to the 4 by 12 timbers, this method being used instead of supporting the joists by hangers or mortising the other timbers. While the proposed method did not conform strictly to the provisions of section 12, paragraph 14, the Board believed no danger would be incurred by allowing the construction to stand as designed, there being no doubt in the minds of the Board as to the strength and stability of the balconies so constructed and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2578.

November 18, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2346. Dismissed.

CASE No. 2579.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was within the fire limits and contemplated an extension of area. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of third-class construction, three stories high and was 24 feet wide. The appellant desired to build an addition 18 feet by 20 feet, one story high, which he wished to use as a wash room in connection with a milk-bottling business. A portion of the building was directly on the lot line. The Board believed that if this portion coming within 5 feet of the lot line were constructed of masonry that no danger would be incurred by allowing the appellant to construct same. Therefore with the proviso "that portion of side wall of the proposed addition coming within 5 feet of the lot line be made of masonry," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No 2580.

November 15, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2299.

CASE No. 2581.

November 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as same would be in violation of the following sections of chapter 550, Acts of 1907, and amendments thereto:

Section 16, paragraph 1, minimum thickness of metal in structural members illegal; paragraph 9, legal riveting required. Section 20, paragraph 1, foundation loads not carried down to satisfactory bearing material; paragraph 20, the building lacks a foundation as required either of brick, stone or concrete. Section 23, paragraph 6, thickness of external walls illegal. Section 32, paragraph 1, fireproofing of structural metal omitted. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2582.

November 15, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2581.

CASE No. 2583.

November 15, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2395.

CASE No. 2584.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

November 15, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect shed as same would be a third-class construction within the building limits. It appeared at the hearing that the structure in question consisted of a temporary roof supported by posts built at the corner of the premises, which was to be used for the storage of junk. Two sides of the proposed shelter are formed by existing fences, the remaining two sides were to be left open. The dimensions of the roof were 16 feet by 18 feet. Owing to the temporary nature of the proposed shed, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2585.

*(Violation of Section 28, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

November 18, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed party wall did not extend at least 12 inches

above the roof covering. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a garage of first-class construction with party wall running to floor. The Board was of the opinion that no advantage to the building would be gained by requiring the appellant to extend the party wall above the roof covering as the present roof was of fireproof construction, so there was a perfect separation between the two buildings. The Board was of the opinion that this was a case not contemplated by the law though covered by it and therefore acting under its discretionary power sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2586.

November 18, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2585.

CASE No. 2587.

November 18, 1921.

The appellant was ordered by the Building Commissioner, under authority of section 8, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, to install nogging in main partition between suites of building in accordance with the provisions of the Boston building laws. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner's order was justifiable and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2588.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

November 18, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction and proposed alteration contemplated an extension of area. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was but one and one half stories high with a store on the first floor. The appellant desired to enlarge this store by means of a small triangular shaped addition, one wall of which was on the lot line. While there was a slight increase in area, the Board was of the opinion that the nature of the addition was such that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board sustained the appeal therefore.

CASE No. 2589.

November 18, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2590.

November 18, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2304.

CASE No. 2591.

November 18, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2413.

CASE No. 2592.

November 18, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2593.

Pending.

CASE No. 2594.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

November 25, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed alteration contemplated a change of occupancy of a two-family dwelling house to a three family. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to construct a fire escape on rear of his building, thus providing a second means of egress. He also desired to adapt the third floor for occupancy by a third family. In view of the housing conditions and the fact that there was to be no change in the exterior of the building, the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2595.

*(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

November 29, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to convert a one-family house of third-class construction to use for a two-family house, as same was within the building limits. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to build an addition 30 feet by 13 feet and erect

piazza, adapting same for use by two families as mentioned above. In view of the nature of the proposed addition the Board believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2596.

November 25, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2597.

November 25, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove wooden building erected within the building limits without a permit. It appeared at the hearing that the structure in question was but 10 feet by 8 feet by 9 feet, built on leased railroad land and was situated at the corner of two streets and was used for the storage of garden produce. It was well isolated, being one half mile from the nearest building. In view of its temporary nature and purpose for which it was to be used, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to remove same and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2598.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 35, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 25, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to remove brick fire wall as the end of building would be of third-class construction in the fire limits and said removal of brick wall would increase the fire risk of the structure as a whole. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of second-class construction and was used as a drop forge. Because of the danger to an existing fire wall on account of vibration, the appellant desired to remove a certain portion of the fire wall substituting steel beams and columns to take the roof and other loads and building new wooden ends covered on both sides with sheet metal. After careful consideration of the case, the Board believed that no added fire risk would be incurred by allowing the appellant to make the proposed changes. Moreover, the Board believed that conditions would be improved, as the effect on the building from the vibration of the heavy

drop hammers would be minimized. Under the circumstances, therefore, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2599.

(Violation of Section 12, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 25, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as egress was not satisfactory to the Building Commissioner. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of second-class construction and was to be occupied for stores. The plans showed but one means of egress from the basement. As the basement was used mostly for storage purposes, the Board believed that, if one front sash in cellar in the basement was arranged to open and a permanent platform or ladder were constructed beneath, thus providing a second means of egress, the basement would be provided with reasonable egress. Therefore with the proviso "that one front sash in cellar in the basement be arranged to open and a permanent platform or ladder be constructed beneath," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2600.

(Violation of Section 39, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 29, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter third-class building as part of same was less than 5 feet from the lot line without brick or concrete wall. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a two-family house with a pitched roof. The appellant desired to construct piazzas of 4-inch iron angles and iron railing with wooden floors at the first and second floor levels. The Board believed that "if the soffit of the underside of wooden floor joists at the second floor level were protected with wire lath and plaster there would be no fire risk involved by the type of construction proposed"; and that it would be manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the above proviso, therefore, the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2601.

(Violation of Section 9, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 29, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction and proposed alteration contemplated an extension of area in a building situated in the fire limits. It appeared at the hearing that the appellant desired to increase the area of building 80 square feet in the interior portion of the building. Certain wooden walls were to be removed and replaced with brick and corrugated asbestos. Owing to the slight increase in area and method of construction proposed, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2602.

December 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2600.

CASE No. 2603.

November 29, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2215.

CASE No. 2604.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 23, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 29, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was within the building limits and the proposed alteration contemplated wooden construction, also the thickness of proposed external walls were illegal. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was originally of second and third class construction. In making alterations for the improvement of the building, the appellant desired to construct a small penthouse with the exposed side having a 12-inch brick wall. The remaining walls were to be of stud and cement stucco on wire lath. It appeared that a permit was granted for walls covered with stucco and cement on wire lath and the appellant in ignorance of the law boarded in one side of the structure. The Board believed that the

construction used was the equivalent of that allowed by law and therefore believed it a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit to finish work. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2605.

(Violation of Sections 8 and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 29, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed windows in party wall and the carrying of floor joists were not in accordance with the provisions of the above-mentioned sections. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was of second-class construction and was to be used for mercantile purposes on the first floor and for offices on floors above. With reference to section 13, the Board believed that the appellant was entitled to the same consideration as would have been given for mercantile buildings where the use of metal covered shutters was allowed and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to this section. With reference to section 8, the construction in variance with the law referred to the carrying of floor joists on 4 by 4 hard pine ledgers resting on the angle of the floor beams and bolted through the flange. The Board was of the opinion that the construction proposed conformed to the spirit of the law and believed therefore that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2606.

(Violation of Section 20, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

November 29, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed foundations were not carried down to bearing material in accordance with the provisions of the above section. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a small pump house of tile block with a concrete mat for a foundation and its size was 18 feet by 18 feet by 13 feet. The building was to be situated on leased railroad property and was therefore of a temporary nature. For this reason the

appellant did not want to go down to hardpan but desired to use a spread foundation as mentioned above. The Board believed that "if the spread footings were made satisfactory to the Building Commissioner" that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. With the above proviso therefore the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2607.

November 29, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2606.

CASE No. 2608.

December 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2569.

CASE No. 2609.

December 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2569.

CASE No. 2610.

December 2, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2395.

CASE No. 2611.

December 2, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2612.

*(Violation of Sections 35 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907,
as Amended.)*

December 6, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as the exposure for habitation required on the widest street has been obstructed by the erection of the proposed second-class section of building and wooden building will be more than three stories high and more than 40 feet in height above the first floor line. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2613.

(Violation of Section 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

December 2, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same would exceed the legal 10,000 square feet allowed for a third-class building of this type. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was located on the beach and was used only for the storing of yachts during the winter season, and in the summer season only for such boats as would be out of commission. In view of the fact that proposed building was well isolated, being situated at the edge of the water and at a great distance from any buildings except those of the owner, the Board believed it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2614.

December 2, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove asphalt shingles on roofs of his buildings as same were in violation of the provisions of section 13, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the buildings in question were five small garages built on separate lots, which are of second-class construction, with the exception of the roofs, which were covered with asphalt shingles. The appellant had been granted a permit by the department for the buildings in accordance with plans submitted, which showed roofs covered with asphalt shingles. While a violation existed, the Board believed, under the circumstances, it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to remove same. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2615.

December 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2569.

CASE No. 2616.

December 2, 1921.

The Board found that this appeal with reference to the installation of gongs, etc., was in violation of a special

act, which was not in amendment of chapter 550 of the Acts of 1907, nor in any way incorporated therein, over which the Board had no jurisdiction. The Board was therefore obliged to dismiss the appeal.

CASE No. 2617.

December 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2569.

CASE No. 2618.

Pending.

CASE No. 2619.

December 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2569.

CASE No. 2620.

December 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2215.

CASE No. 2521 AND No. 2522.

December 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2569.

CASE No. 2523.

Pending.

CASE No. 2524.

December 14, 1921.

Case void because it was not filed within the prescribed thirty days.

CASE No. 2625.

December 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2626.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

December 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same would make building more than 40 feet in height above the first floor line and building would

exceed 60 per cent of the lot. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a two-family pitched roof dwelling house of third-class construction. The appellant desired to raise the building and build a store underneath. The plans showed the store of strictly second-class construction and ample egress was provided from the dwelling portion of building. In view of all conditions and the fact that the dwelling house would be greatly improved by the proposed change, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2627.

December 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2613.

CASE No. 2628.

December 14, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2540.

CASE No. 2629.

Pending.

CASE No. 2630.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

December 14, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits and part of a second-class building was less than 5 feet from line without a wall. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plant that the building in question was a single family dwelling house of second-class construction. There was a small wooden bay at the second story level and the appellant desired to continue the same type of bay construction to the third floor, no alteration being made to the existing bay at the second floor level. The bay was small, being but 2 feet 8 inches by 5 feet 9 inches. Owing to the minor character of the proposed alteration, the Board believed that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2631.

December 6, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASE No. 2632.

(Violation of Section 4, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

December 17, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to use hall as a dance hall as "building was not built for same and could not, therefore, be legally occupied as such." It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of first-class construction. It contained a small hall on the second floor which the appellant desired to use as a hall for dancing lessons and occasionally for public dances. The hall did not accommodate at the most over seventy couples and was provided with direct means of egress to the street by way of a fireproof concrete stairs. The Board understood that a second means of egress could be provided by passing through the Red Cross quarters on the same floor. Therefore with the proviso "that arrangements were made to provide egress to the fire escape at the second floor and proper directions and light be provided to explain location of same," the Board sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2633.

(Violation of Sections 9, 13, 39 and 40, Chapter 550, Acts 1907, as Amended.)

December 17, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed alteration contemplated an extension of ground area to a third-class building within the fire limits and would also exceed the 5,000 square feet and was not to be covered with incombustible material. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a small addition to a third-class building which already covered more than the legal area. Proposed addition was of noncombustible material and was only 14 feet by 24 feet one story high, and was to be built at the second floor level and was to be supported by steel posts. Owing to the nature and size of the proposed

alteration, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2634.

(Violation of Section 65 and 58, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

December 17, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed lighting of public halls was illegal and width of outer court was less than $\frac{1}{8}$ of the length of said court. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a tenement house of second-class construction. With reference to the lighting of public halls, the appellant showed provisions for lighting by means of sashes in the corridor partitions and further by the staircase windows. The building had an exposure on three sides and on courts in the rear. Owing to the triangular lot on which the building was to be built, great difficulty was found in providing direct light at the end of the hall. The Board agreed with the appellant in his contention that method proposed by him for lighting the corridors was superior to that required under section 65 and therefore sustained the appeal in this particular. With reference to the dimensions of the court, it appeared that, owing to the triangular shape of the lot, the court did not conform strictly to the provisions of the above mentioned section. The Board found, however, that the area of this irregular court was greater than the legal area required and therefore the appellant had conformed to the spirit of the law. The Board therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2635.

December 19, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove violation of section 80, chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as amended, existing on his premises. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a theater and that the appellant, in making alterations to same, had provided a screen over an existing stand up rail. The Board understood that this screen was built and that it did not diminish existing present openings which

had been in place for many years and which were ample for a theater of this size. In view of the above the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to remove same and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2636.

December 19, 1921.

The appellant was ordered to remove exit stairs as same were not erected in conformity with the provisions of sections 12 and 103 governing egress. It appeared at the hearing that the stairs in question gave egress from the balcony of a theater. In view of certain existing conditions, the particular staircase in question could only be made effective by means of winders. The Board carefully examined the plans and was of the opinion that egress as provided was ample and that no danger would be incurred by allowing winders in this particular case. The Board was of the opinion, therefore, that it would be a manifest injustice to require the appellant to remove same and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2637.

(Violation of Section 14, Paragraph 52, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

December 17, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as proposed unit stresses in timber construction exceeded allowable stress by 400 per cent and more. The Board having heard the appellant and having examined the plans concurred with the Building Commissioner in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal.

CASE No. 2638.

December 17, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2413.

CASE No. 2639.

(Violation of Sections 9, 23, and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

December 21, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire

limits and party wall of masonry was omitted. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was of second-class construction. The wooden construction in question was the extension of a 5-foot party wall by means of studded partition and covered with wire lath and plaster on both sides. The Board understood the brick party wall in question was not required under the Building Law. In view of this and the fact that the soil would not carry a brick party wall, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2640.

December 21, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2639.

CASE No. 2641.

(Violation of Sections 9, 20, and 40, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907 as Amended.)

December 21, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect an addition to his building as same was of third-class construction, foundation loads were not carried down to satisfactory bearing material and addition was less than 5 feet to the lot line without a wall. It appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a small shed built against the side of a second-class building. It was 8 feet by 16 feet and was built by a licensed carpenter, who did not advise the appellant that same was illegal. The shed was used merely for the storage of coal and wood as mentioned above. Under the circumstances the Board was inclined to dismiss the appeal by removing building entirely. It believed, however, that it would be a hardship to the appellant who was not aware that same was illegal. The Board was of the opinion, therefore, "if the building was covered on the exterior with corrugated iron" that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore sustained the appeal with this proviso.

CASE No. 2642.

December 21, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2335.

CASE No. 2643.

(Violation of Sections 12, 43, 55, 59 and 65, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

December 21, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to erect building as proposed kitchenettes had a least dimension of less than 6 feet; plans showed openings through first floor; suites did not have direct access to both stairways; inner court on line was less than 8 feet in its least dimension and proposed lighting of public halls was illegal. It appeared at the hearing that while one kitchenette was less than 6 feet in its least dimension, the area of same was in excess of that required by law. The Board believed that the spirit of the law had been complied with and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 12. With reference to proposed openings through first floor; it appeared at the hearing that the building in question was a tenement house of second-class construction, and the appellant had provided a passageway leading directly to the street from the basement which gave access to three or four dumb waiters in the basement used to serve the various suites above. The first floor of the building was of fireproof construction and the walls surrounding the dumb waiter shaft were also of fireproof construction. The Board believed "if the dumb waiter openings were protected by self-closing fireproof doors provided with a fusible link in addition to the usual door provided that the first floor would be cut off effectively from the basement" that it would be a hardship to require the appellant to start all dumb waiters from the first floor. And therefore with the above proviso the Board sustained the appeal with reference to section 17. With reference to section 55, the Board found that while the yard was slightly less than 12 feet in depth the average width was 11 feet and the irregularity of the lot was such that it was impossible to conform strictly to the above-mentioned section without the sacrifice of a large part of one room. The Board therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 55. It also appeared at the hearing that the inner court in question was a small recessed court leading from the inner court with a dimension of 4 feet. This space could have been incorporated in the plan proper so that this court could have been eliminated. The Board, however, saw no advantage to

the building in requiring the appellant to do this and believed here again the spirit of the law had been complied with. With reference to section 65, it appeared that the public hall in question was quite small and was amply lighted by a large staircase window not far removed from the hall proper. The Board believed that this method of borrowed light was the equivalent of that required by law and therefore sustained the appeal with reference to section 65. With reference to the suites not having direct access to both stairways, the Board, after examining the plans, was of the opinion that the Building Commissioner was justified in his refusal and therefore dismissed the appeal with reference to section 43.

CASE No. 2644.

Pending.

CASE No. 2645.

December 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASES No. 2646 AND No. 2647.

Pending.

CASE No. 2648.

Pending.

CASE No. 2649.

December 19, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2569. Dismissed; sprinklers.

CASE No. 2650.

December 21, 1921.

Withdrawn. Appellant complied with law.

CASE No. 2651.

December 21, 1921.

Withdrawn. Appellant had installed sprinklers.

CASE No. 2652.

December 21, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2651.

CASE No. 2653.

December 21, 1921.

Appellant requested that his case be continued until January 15, 1922.

CASE No. 2654.

Pending.

CASE No. 2655.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

CASES No. 2656 AND No. 2657.

Pending.

CASE No. 2658.

(Violation of Sections 9 and 13, Chapter 550, Acts of 1907, as Amended.)

December 28, 1921.

The appellant was refused a permit to alter building as same was of third-class construction within the fire limits and further, proposed alterations contemplated an extension of area of a third-class building. It appeared at the hearing and upon examination of the plans that the building in question was occupied as a store and dwelling house. The appellant desired to remove present wooden steps and replace a glass store front in its stead, thus increasing the floor area fifty feet. He also desired to further improve the store by lowering the floor to the street grade. Owing to the nature of the proposed alteration, the Board was of the opinion that it would be a manifest injustice to refuse the appellant a permit and therefore acting under its discretionary power sustained the appeal.

CASE No. 2659.

December 28, 1921.

Similar to Case No. 2218.

